

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter elaborates the method which was employed in this study. It includes research design, object of the study, research question, and data collection and analysis method.

#### 3.1. Research Design

The method employed in this study is qualitative approach equipped with Conversation Analysis method. The qualitative approach is chosen since the data and results of this study are mainly presented in the form of narrative description, not numerical or statistical (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Furthermore, Conversation Analysis method is used to portray the sequence organization of invitation dialogues in the textbooks, as this method has been believed to well reveal the potential problem of textbook dialogues and portray their accordance with the organization of authentic conversations (Sert & Seedhouse, 2011).

The use of this research design helps the researcher to effectively describe how the models of invitation dialogue in the textbooks present the pre-expansions (pre-sequences) and preference and dispreference organization proposed by Schegloff (2007), Yule (1996), Levinson (2008), Davidson (2003), and Drew (2003). The writer decides to choose these two elements of sequence organization to be analyzed, since the objectives of learning invitation stated in Indonesia curriculum are expressing, accepting, and declining invitation. Those three language functions are related to the two previous elements of sequence organization.

#### 3.2. Object of the Study

This study attempts to evaluate textbook dialogues of invitation in students' English textbooks published by Indonesia Ministry of Education, consisting of five textbooks of School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) 2006. The three textbooks are

Fahmia Nur Azizah, 2015

*THE ANALYSIS OF PRE-EXPANSIONS AND PREFERENCE ORGANIZATION OF INVITATION DIALOGUES IN EFL TEXTBOOKS: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

those for grade 8, entitled *Contextual Teaching and Learning, English in Focus,* and *Scaffolding*, and the rest are those for grade 10 entitled *Developing English Competencies* and *Interlanguage*. From all selected textbooks, there are 34 dialogues containing invitation which were analyzed in this study.

The textbooks were chosen since the language functions of invitation are learned in the above-mentioned grades, in accordance with what are stated in the content standard of School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) 2006. Furthermore, they are published by the government and have been used in most Indonesian schools as the fundamental sources of teaching and learning English. Meanwhile, the textbooks of 2013 Curriculum were not chosen because they are currently in trial and have not been fully implemented in all schools.

### **3.3. Research Question**

This study tries to answer the following questions:

- 3.3.1. To what extent do the invitation dialogues in the textbooks present pre-expansions suggested in Conversation Analysis studies?
- 3.3.2. Are the preference/dispreference organization displayed accurately in the dialogues?

### **3.4. Data Collection and Analysis Method**

#### **3.4.1. Instruments**

The data (the dialogues) which have been collected from the five textbooks are expected to show the accurate pre-expansions and preference organization of invitation dialogues suggested in CA. To answer the first research question, the data were analyzed based on the following questions:

1. What type of pre-expansion displayed in the dialogue?
2. Does the pre-expansion displayed in the dialogue reflect the accurate interactional function?

Fahmia Nur Azizah, 2015

**THE ANALYSIS OF PRE-EXPANSIONS AND PREFERENCE ORGANIZATION OF INVITATION DIALOGUES IN EFL TEXTBOOKS: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS**

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

3. Do the textbooks provide explanation regarding the use of pre-expansions in invitation?

Furthermore, to answer the second research question, the following questions were formulated to help analyze the data:

1. What type of preference organization reflected in the dialogue?
2. How does the dialogue exhibit the features of preference organization described in CA (including preferred and dispreferred response, subsequent versions, and speaker's reportings)?
3. Does the dialogue exhibit the accurate interactional function of each feature of preference organization?

### **3.4.2. Data Analysis**

In this section, the data collected will be analyzed. The data analysis will be presented in form of narrative description, following the analysis presented in Schegloff (2007), Yule (1996), Davidson (2003), and Drew (2003). It will be classified in some points according to the occurrence of pre-expansion as well as the types of pre-expansion and preference organization displayed in the dialogues. Furthermore, each dialogue will be elaborated and discussed in terms of the type/feature and interactional function of the pre-expansion and preference organization contained as well as their accordance with the theory used. In some points, for the sake of practicability, the name of the textbooks in the elaboration will be abbreviated as CTL for *Contextual Teaching and Learning*, EF for *English in Focus*, SC for *Scaffolding*, DEC for *Developing English Competencies* and INT for *Interlanguage*.

To answer the first research question, the data will be analyzed based on the three questions formulated earlier which are related to the type of pre-expansions, the interactional function of pre-expansion, and the explanation/instruction of the use of pre-expansion. The appearance of analysis would probably be like the following:

Fahmia Nur Azizah, 2015

**THE ANALYSIS OF PRE-EXPANSIONS AND PREFERENCE ORGANIZATION OF INVITATION  
DIALOGUES IN EFL TEXTBOOKS: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS**

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

### **Pre-invitation with a hedging response**

The dialogue below accurately exhibits a pre-invitation with a hedging response, as the following:

*(Developing English Competencies 10, p.107)*

*After visiting the museum, on the way home, Ratna invites Ardi to have dinner together.*

- 1 Ratna : → Are you free tonight?
- 2 Ardi : → Why?
- 3 Ratna : → I wonder if you would like to have dinner at my house.
- 4 Ardi : I won't say no. I'll be there.

As can be seen in the dialogue, Ratna firstly makes a pre-invitation “Are you free tonight?” which receives Ardi’s hedging response, “Why?” as the whole response, showing that he orients to Ratna’s question as a possible pre-invitation. Ardi’s acceptance and rejection will depend on the character of the invitation. This is the same as the form of hedging response described in Schegloff (2007). In this case, as stated in Ingeten (2012), the speaker may have several choices of action: go ahead with the FPP and risk a dispreferred response; respond with *no reason* and deny that any type of action was being projected; or say what the invitation would have been. The dialogue demonstrates the last action, as Ratna further says what her invitation would be and it is accepted by Ardi in line 4 with “I won't say no. I'll be there”. In spite of this accurate display, the book doesn’t provide any explanation of pre-invitation, which consequently would be unable to raise students’ awareness of the strategy to minimize the risk of rejected invitation (Yule, 1996).

Similarly, to answer the second research question, the data will be analyzed based on the earlier three questions regarding the type of preference organization displayed, its feature and interactional function. The result of analysis would be presented as below:

### **Invitation with preferred response**

Fahmia Nur Azizah, 2015

*THE ANALYSIS OF PRE-EXPANSIONS AND PREFERENCE ORGANIZATION OF INVITATION DIALOGUES IN EFL TEXTBOOKS: A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

The following dialogue contains invitation with preferred responses and speaker's reporting used by the inviter (the speaker). However, the reporting found appears to lose their function which has been explained by Drew (2003). In addition, the dialogue demonstrates preferred responses in relatively short expressions:

*(English in Focus 8, p.54)*

*Diana, her friends Shinta and Toni are walking home from school. They are talking about a party at Diana's house tonight.*

- 1 Diana : → Shinta, I am going to have a party tonight. Would you
- 2 → like to come?
- 3 Shinta : → **I'd love to!** By the way, what are you celebrating?
- 4 Diana : I won the Science Olympics last week.
- 5 Shinta : Congratulations. Wow, you're very clever.
- 6 Diana : Not at all. You just have to study harder. Will you come to
- 7 my party?
- 8 Toni : I'm sorry, I can't. My parents are going to go to the
- 9 hospital. I may be late getting to your party, is that all
- 10 right?
- 11 Diana : Yes, it's all right as long as you are allowed by your
- 12 parents.
- 13 Shinta : Hmm, speaking about parents, I have to call my father to
- 14 ask his permission.

As in line 1, Diana produces an invitation which is preceded by her reporting, "I am going to have a party tonight". According to Drew (2003), when the reporting is used by the speaker, it functions to test recipients' likely reactions, by finding what they do in response to a position implied through the reporting, and to prompt self-invitations from the recipient. It means that the speaker should wait and give an opportunity for the recipient to respond to the reportings. This function is lost in the dialogue since the speaker's reporting was produced in the same turn as the invitation. The dialogue only presents how the recipient gives a preferred response toward the invitation. As can be seen in line 3, the response takes the short form of pleasure expression, "I'd love to".