CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

Basically, the underlying method used in this study refers to the procedure conducted by Gilmore (2004). Three points namely the materials used as the sources of textbook data, the reality-like dialogue performers, and the procedure of the collecting and analyzing the data are elaborated throughout this chapter.

A. Materials

This comparative study investigates the differences in terms of discourse features between the models of audio dialogues provided in three textbooks published by a prominent commercial publisher and the comparable reality-like interactions. The books chosen as the source of textbook dialogue data are Pathway to English 1, 2, and 3 written by Sudarwati & Grace (2013a, 2013b, 2013c). The decision on choosing those books is justified by three reasons. First, as can be seen from the title, those books are specified for the elective program of senior high schools where the participants of this program are students whose ability are considered above average (Kemendikbud, 2014). With this rationale, the books are expected to cope with the argument against authentic materials which is commonly emphasized on the level of difficulty (e.g. Duda & Tyne, 2010; Widowson, 1998). Secondly, the textbooks are familiar and widely used in the Indonesian EFL classroom as proven by the fact that they are widely distributed throughout Indonesia. Lastly, from many textbooks available, they are the books from which the audio files could be gained since not all publishers provide them.

Hundreds of audio dialogues provided by the textbook samples were sorted considering the length, the variety of the topics and their possibility to be performed by the reality-like dialogue performers. In this research, only long dialogues were taken as the samples because the short dialogue samples provided by the textbooks were not complete dialogues. They were only part of dialogues which were used to focus on certain language functions. Moreover, it is also important to limit the research to investigate the

49

equivalent topics since, as Carter & McCarthy (1997, p. 8) suggest, "different types of talk produce different types of language". As such, we might expect to see interactions which closely correspond to authentic discourse (Gilmore, 2004). Moreover, the consideration of selecting the dialogues was also based on the probability of the dialogue performers to act them. As the naturalness of the reality-like equivalents were the priority, only those which suited the performers' context were selected as the textbook dialogue samples. For example, the topic in the textbook was about debating something; if the performers considered that they did not like debate and it was impossible for them to perform it, this topic was then nullified. Finally, through some considerations, 10 dialogues with different topics were then selected as the textbook data (TD) and taken as the comparison of their equivalent dialogues occurring in the real contexts. The following table describes the different topics and the situations of the dialogues:

Table 1. Topics and Situations of Textbook Audio Dialogues

Topic	Situation
Topic 1	The speakers complain about the cold weather.
Topic 2	The speakers are talking about the anti-deforestation activity.
Topic 3	A student asks permission to his teacher because his village has just been struck by a disaster and the teacher expresses her condolence.
Topic 4	Speaker 2 tells speaker 1 that his weekend was terrible because he and his family found all the tables were reserved when going to a restaurant. Speaker 1 suggests that he should have reserved the table before going there.
Topic 5	A man gives a recommendation about a good place to spend the following vacation.
Topic 6	A man gives an explanation to his friend about how heat stroke occurs in the human body.
Topic 7	A man and a woman discuss a seminar program held by a certain organization.
Topic 8	A man tells his friend that he is very excited after listening to FIFA world Cup anthem.
Topic 9	A man offers help to a woman who finds her car in trouble.
Topic 10	Two speakers debate about the banning of old cars on the road.

B. Reality-like Conversation Performers

In this study, six native speakers were chosen as the participants which performed the reality-like dialogues. Their involvement was in regard to the collection of the reality-like dialogues which were expected to be the comparison of the textbook dialogues. The consideration of appointing the dialogue performers was based on their possibility in producing the dialogues which were considerably equivalent to the chosen textbook dialogues.

There were three pairs of native speakers who were either intentionally or unintentionally involved in this research. The first pair consists of a man and a woman working as English teachers and both of them are from Canada. They were directly involved in this research by being asked to perform the dialogues and they finally performed seven dialogues (Topic 1-7) which they thought doable for them. The second pair also consists of a man and a woman; the former is an English lecturer from Canada and the latter is an internship student from New Zeeland. Like the first pair, they were also directly involved in this research and performed two dialogues, those were Topic 8 and 9. There was one dialogue left, that was Topic 10, which was considered undoable by the four speakers. However, it was considered that there was still a possibility to find its authentic equivalent. Finally, a debate performed by two English persons; a man and a woman, and podcasted in BBC website was taken as the comparable dialogue. In such case, the dialogue performers were not intentionally asked to involve in this research. In respect to the performers' privacy, the identity of all the performers was not identified in this study (Gay et al., 2009) and 'S1' and 'S2 ' were then used.

C. Procedures

The chosen audio files of the textbook dialogues were transcribed. Considering the similarity, the reality-like conversations were then sought by asking the participants to perform the dialogues with the same topics. Commonly, the exchanges in textbook audio dialogues ran smoothly. This fact indicates that the speakers performing in the dialogues had enough

background knowledge of the topic they were discussing. Therefore, this became the rationale for choosing the topics which were sufficiently known by the reality-like dialogue performers. This kind of procedure was aimed at making an equal comparison. Indeed, it would have been ideal to get realistic samples without predetermined topic of the interaction and conversation so that the dialogues performed by the performers could be considered as authentic dialogues. However, such natural method would have been problematic as it could have been extremely time-consuming and might not have resulted in the desired outcomes (Nunan, 1992). Consequently, in such condition the dialogues could not fulfill the criteria of being authentic language due to the fact that they had them performed. To minimize the artificiality, one of the people in each pair was not informed about the kinds of talk that would be performed so the responses given by the other speaker in each pair could be uttered naturally. Consequently, the dialogues were considered as reality-like instead of authentic or natural.

Both audio dialogues from the textbooks and from the natural encounters were transcribed using transcription conventions commonly used in conversation analysis proposed by Markee (2009). In the process of transcription, the features which were intentionally identified were those which were related to this research. This was conducted to ease the process of identifying the features in the transcripts as one symbol can represent more than one feature. The conventions used in the transcription process are as follows:

(1) = unfilled pause/pause between turn (can be 1, 2 or else)

= = latch

⌈ = overlap

: = drawling

hh = laugh

〔 〕 = back-channel

( ) = unclear fragment

Following this, the transcriptions of any spoken data both from the textbook dialogues and from the reality-like interactions were then compared

based on the number of the occurrences. Since the number of the words and the turn-takings in TD and RD were different, it was initially thought to take this difference into account to create a proportional comparison. Nonetheless, as the number of the appearance of the features in TD is all 0, as can be seen later in Chapter IV, it was then assumed that those differences would not even affect each other. In other words, regardless the bigger number of words and turn-takings either in TD or in RD, TD will never present the features or will still be 0. Another potential risk in comparing the data was when dealing with lexical density. As can be noted in the Appendices, there are some words which are unclear due to the overlaps or because the speakers speak too low so that they are left uncounted. These uncounted words, indeed, affect the lexical density. However, this was not considered influencing significantly because of the small numbers of the unclear fragments and somehow it is normal to find them in natural talks.

Once the comparison was accomplished, the results were then critically viewed based on the previous research findings and theories mostly presented in Chapter II. The following table summarizes the features which were recorded in the transcriptions and the relevant research questions:

Table. 2 Recorded Features and Related Research Questions

Features	Research questions
Hesitation	Is the frequency of hesitation devices different through sets of data taken both from textbook dialogues and from the reality-like conversation?
Pauses, Latches and overlaps	Do pauses, latches, and overlaps occur during the transition relevance places (TRPs) in both sets of data?
Back-channels	Do back-channels occur in both sets of data?
Lexical Density	Is the lexical density in both sets of data different?

D. Sample of Data Analysis

In respect to the procedure of analyzing the data, including the way the audio dialogues were transcribed, the following sample explains how the working procedure was carried out.

1. *Sample of Textbook Audio Dialogue Transcription*

1 <S1> It's really cold now isn't it

2 <S2> Right It's cold outside and you know I have to wait for a bus

3 <S1> Yes and it isn't fun to wait more than fifteen minutes

4 <S2> Fifteen minutes We've been waiting here for more than fifteen minutes

5 <S1> Correct That's why I am freezing

6 <S2> But we're not alone Look at those people They've been standing there before we came

7 <S1> What a pity They've been watching the traffic looking for a bus and hoping the bus will come soon

8 <S2> Can you guess what they've been talking about They seem noisy

9 <S1> Perhaps they've been talking about the bus and complaining about the weather

10 <S2> Do you think they feel cold It seems they are OK with the cold weather

11 <S1> I think so too Look They've been drinking something to keep them warm

12 <S2> How about warm coffee

13 <S1> That's a good idea By the time the bus comes we will have finished our coffee

14 <S2> Actually I had stopped drinking coffee when I knew that it was not good for my stomach But today is different I need it to keep me warm

15 <S1> OK Let's go to the coffee machine

2. *Sample of Reality-like Interaction Transcription*

1 <S1> Alright is it just me it is really hot lately

2 <S2> I'm not sure too I I mean I'm not I usually walk to work a:nd (1) I just find Maybe because it's just the middle of the day but I was

I was sweaty by the time I got the office [hm:] I thought it might've been just me but =

3 <S1>   = No no I I'm uh: hot and sweaty too

4 <S2> Hm I don't know

5 <S1> Ya I'm sweating right now actually it's really hot

6 <S2> Is it just I'm just it is like humidity or it's unusual or it just seems really hot ⌐ I don't know

7 <S1>   └ It's⌉   It's It's more humid than usual I look that from the internet It's really more humid than usual

8 <S2> Ok And everyone says it's just global warming I I don't know it's it's just kind of I don't know ⌐ it's just

9 <S1>   └ uh: I think it could be pretty weird weather [uhum]

10 <S2> Hard to say but (1) I'm gonna have a shower I think

After the process of the analysis, as explained in the procedure, the results are shown below:

Table. 3 Sample of Research Findings

Features	Topic 1	
	TD	RD
Hesitation Markers		
Unfilled pauses	0	2
Filled pauses	0	3
Repetitions	0	6
False starts	0	4
Drawlings	0	1
Turn-Taking		
Pauses between turn	0	0
Latches	0	1
Overlaps	0	2
Backchannels	0	2
Lexical Density (%)	56.91	46.54

E. The Research Process

The research process started with making the proposal which was carried out in October 2015. Following this, the proposal then underwent several revisions by considering the feedback given by academic supervisors. Having been revised, the proposal was then approved by the head of English Education Program to be examined. From the examination, conducted on 26th of February 2016, several feedbacks were gained and taken into consideration for another revision. This was compulsory to fulfill the requirement of getting an advisor. Having undergone the final revision, the proposal was then approved to be consulted the assigned advisor. This was the final step of working on the proposal before the advisor finally issued the permission of the data collection process.

In this research, there are two types of data; textbook data (TD) and reality-like data (RD). The TD collection was conducted first, from 1st until 7th of March 2016 and this process determined the topics of the possible equivalent RD. In collecting RD, there were some challenges that should be worked on. The first challenge was that it was quite difficult to find native speakers who met the criteria and were willing to be the dialogue performers. Another challenge was that it was fairly problematic to decide the topics of the conversation which suited the participants' context since the context suitability was aimed at obtaining the RD which was expected to be as natural as possible. The RD collection was conducted in different time due to the fact that the dialogue performers were not located at the same place. Topic 1 until 7 were recorded in Bandung, from 17th until 24 of April 2016, while the remaining topics were recorded in Purwokerto on 25th and 26th of April, 2016. Following this process, the data were then analyzed and the research report writing was started. The data analysis process was accomplished on 2nd of May, 2016, and after experiencing several revisions this research report was finally examined on 12th and 26th of August, 2016.