CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter deals with the methodology of the study. It contains the formulation of the problems and the research design. The research design covers several aspects, namely research methods, participants, source of data collection, data collection, data analysis, clarification of terms and examples of data analysis.

1.1 Formulation of Problems

The problems of the research are formulated as follows:

1. What strategies do the speakers use to observe their hearers' face?
2. How does the hearer respond to the speaker as the realization of speaker's observing hearer's face?
3. What are the effects resulted from (non) observing?

3.2 Research Method

3.2.1 Research Design

The study applied a descriptive method in describing the data. As stated by Kothari (2004), descriptive method enables the researcher to describe the characteristics of a particular individual, situation or a group.

The study mainly employed a qualitative approach to analyze the data since the study primarily aims to investigate the human behaviour in this case the way they communicate to each other. Since the present study aims to reveal how the speakers observe their hearers' face in the conversations, the qualitative method is suitable to explore such problem happening among people whether it is social problem or human problem (Creswell, 2009).

3.2.2 Participants

The study involved 21 Indonesian *Twitter* users who were purposively chosen. According to Kothari (2004), purposive sampling is also known as deliberate sampling or non-probability sampling. It refers to purposive selected samples of the universe which represents the universe itself. The participants were active *Twitter* users who frequently posted a *tweet* at least 5 times a day and they got involved in conversations during the six months period of the data collecting of the research calculated from June 2013 until December 2013.

3.2.3 Source of Data

The data were taken from *Twitter*. *Twitter* is a real-time information network that connects you to the latest stories, ideas, opinions and news about what you find interesting (www.twitter.com). The data were the *tweets* posted in the *timeline* of the 21 participants who got involved in conversations. There were 6 sets of conversation with different topics and length. Each conversation was made by at least 3 participants. The data were taken only in the first two days after the initial *tweet* was posted.

3.2.4 Data Collection

The data collection involved two steps. The first step was retrieving data from *Twitter* website. The data were the *tweets* posted in the *timeline* of the 21 participants who got involved in conversations. There were 6 sets of conversation with different topics and length of which each conversation was made by at least 3 participants. The data were taken only in the first two days after the initial *tweet* was posted. The second step was deciphering the sets of conversations which have been collected to find how the conversations flow. The observation was conducted from June 2013

until October 2013. The *timelines* of the participants were intensively observed in order to get the complete conversations.

1.2.5 Data Analysis

The data collected were first analyzed and categorized by using the concept of face and the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). The first, each tweet was broken down into chunks. Second, every chunk was analyzed whether it was observing or non-observing the hearers' face. Third, each chunk was categorized based on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies.

The next was the analysis of the hearers' responses as the realization of the speakers' observance. The responses given by the hearers were analyzed similarly to the steps as mentioned above. Each response was analyzed to reveal how hearers (who then became a speaker) responded to the speakers (who then became a hearer), whether they observed their speakers in the same way or not as the realization of the speakers' observance. Furthermore, the effects resulted from the observance were analyzed by analyzing the flow of the conversation between the participants.

1.2.6 Clarification of Terms

1. *Twitter*

   "Twitter is a real-time information network that connects you to the latest stories, ideas, opinions and news about what you find interesting" (www.twitter.com).

2. *Twitter timeline*

   "It is a *twitter* visualization tool that allows you to view your twitter feed in a timeline format" (www.twittertimeline.com).

3. *Tweet*

   Tweet can be both verb and noun. *Tweet* as a verb is defined as 'the act of posting a message on *Twitter"*. Meanwhile, *Tweet* as a noun refers to "a

message posted via *Twitter* containing 140 characters or fewer" (www.support.twitter.com).

4. Face

   "The self-image which must be kept and maintained. The *face* can be damaged or even lost" (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

5. Observance

   The awareness or the attention shown by the speakers towards their hearers' face.

3.2.7 Examples of Data Analysis

The following example shows the structure of a typical tweet. The example was coded with alphabetical letters **(a-c)** of which the explanation of each code is provided below.

1. **DRP** @dexxx
   Besok pukul 10.30 WIB screening Mr.Postman di Bismegaplex, Braga Festival #KaneronBragaFest
2. **RMM (a)** @utomxxxx **(b)**
   @dexxx bang dey besok doang adanya? minggu ga ada? **(c)**
3. **DRP** @dexxx
   @utomxxxx minggu ada Mr.Postman di Bismegaplex jam 4 sore utoo :)

Note:
1. First tweet
2. Initial *tweet* which starts a conversation
   a. Name of the *Twitter* user
   b. Username
   c. Tweet
3. A reply to initial *tweet* (response)

The example above is an example of a tweet and its structure. A tweet posted by speakers may consist of one or more utterances. The followings are the examples of the analysis:

Example [A]

14. **WN** @weadblxxx
    @widyaxxx @sabaixxx ribut aja deh.. weekend2 masih ribut. hih!
15. **I @sabaixxx**
    @weadblxxx @widyaxxx iya maap ya tante waaaay
16. **WN** @weadblxxx
    @sabaixxx @widyaxxx ketemuan dong brantemnya. Hha
17. **I @sabaixxx**
    @weadblxxx @widyaxxx ntar dipoyanin di depan fpbs lagi. Ogah
18. **WN** @weadblxxx
    @sabaixxx @widyaxxx beneran mau? hayu lah kita nostalgilaan.
19. **WA** @widyaxxx
    @weadblxxx @sabaixxx apa apa cepet bales bbm hih udah bangun nih aku
20. **WN** @weadblxxx
    @widyaxxx @sabaixxx isty mah lama ahh.. ga nyampe2 ngirim k dia mah.
21. **WA** @widyaxxx
    @weadblxxx @sabaixxx biasa wilayah jangkauannya kan sulit beb wajar (⌣.⌣')\('⌣')
22. **WN** @weadblxxx
    @widyaxxx @sabaixxx lg d kondangan dia. Pffft
23. **WA** @widyaxxx
    @weadblxxx @sabaixxx watir ish ke kondangan batur ajah, kondangan sndri kapan dongs :p
24. **I @sabaixxx**
    @widyaxxx @weadblxxx tinggalin aja gw tinggalin

The chunk of conversation above shows some tweets which contain some face observance. The use of bald on-strategy with different form is found in tweet #19. By saying **cepet bales bbm hih** 'reply *the bbm* immediately', WA does not observe I's negative face. She decides to use a bald on-strategy without any redress. The use of bald on-strategy without any redress is needed to make the message delivered more efficiently (Petríčková, 2012). Responding to Widya's observance, I decides not to observe WA's and WN's negative face in the same time. She uses an off-record strategy by giving a contradictory statement (tweet #24). However, instead of responding to WA's order which asks her to reply the *bbm* immediately, she chooses to give a contradictory statement by saying **tinggalin aja gw tinggalin** 'just leave me,

leave me'. When I gives a contradictory statement, she has created a new topic in the conversation. As we can see in tweet #26 #27 and #28, they are talking about I who feels that she is left by WA and WN in Bandung.