

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter aims to describe the procedure of the research. The first section is the research design used in the study. It discusses the design of the research that relevant to the structure used in the study. This section also consists of the design of data collection, instruments used in the study, and the analysis of the collected data.

3.1. Research Design

The research primarily uses a qualitative method, with the help of descriptive statistics to describe the frequency of the use of address terms. According to Fisher and Marshall (2009), descriptive statistics is used to organize, analyse, and present the collected data using numerical and graphical techniques. This method was chosen because it is suitable to measure and present the frequency of the data in this research.

With regard to the qualitative method, O’Leary (2017) states that the qualitative method highly relied on qualitative data such as words, observations, and experiences that are not quantified and matched to relativism, social constructionism, and subjectivism assumptions. Since the study explores the relationship between the address terms and the users’ identity in social media through words, utterances, adjuncts, the qualitative method allows the researcher to accept multiple perspectives and realities (O’Leary, 2017), and thus this method is relevant to this study.

3.2. Participants of the Study

The participants of the study are the Indonesian young Twitter who replied to selected popular tweets. Youth, based on United Nation, are people from 15 years old to 24 years old. Regarding that definition, the participants' age in this study is from young users, ranging from 15 to 24 years old or middle school students to undergraduate students. These participants are chosen since the active Twitter users are mostly teenagers. Based on Tankovska (2021) in Statista, Indonesia is the 6th country that has the highest number of users worldwide with 14.05 million users. Nurhayati-Wolff (2021) adds that the second-highest social media user in Indonesia

ranged from age 18 to 24, while the first highest is from people aged 25 to 34, and the fourth one is from people aged from 13 to 17. The participants of the study are chosen from people ranged from 15 years old to 24 years old to see the variety of the data from active users on Twitter.

3.3. Data Collection

The data were collected through the reply section of several popular tweets from several particular accounts called auto-base accounts for education. The tweets from the reply sections were copied before analysed. An Auto-base account is an account that can tweet automatically based on the direct message it receives with particular trigger words. In other words, this account is able to tweet what people send through its direct message as long as it follows the rule and the sender will be anonymous. Those auto-bases were chosen because they have considerable numbers of college students and high school students as their followers since they mostly follow back accounts which the owner is college students or high school students (Colle, 2021) and the message that can be sent to the base is education, school, or college-related only (Schfess.id, n.d.). The criteria of popular tweets that are chosen as the data are as follows.

- 1) Tweets that have more than 100 retweets,
- 2) Minimum 50 replies that contain address terms for popular tweets, and
- 3) Tweeted within the pandemic era since young users start actively using social media more often than the use of social media before the pandemic era.

Those criteria were set based on several considerations. The retweets of popular tweets were set according to Porat, Garaizar, Ferrero, Jones, Ashworth, and Vadillo (2019) study of content and source analysis of popular tweets regarding the case of health issues, specifically diphtheria, in Spain. Meanwhile, the minimum of the reply was set by the researcher to ensure that the research has a variety of data of address terms. The limitation time within the pandemic situation was chosen since, in pandemic situations, people start actively using social media to communicate with each other than doing conversations face to face.

The beginning of the data collection procedures was the tweets under the reply section were filtered based on several criteria before it is categorized based

on the address terms and the context. The criteria for the tweets under the reply section are as follows.

- a) Include address terms, and
- b) Tweeted by the users ranged from 15 to 24 years old or still in high school and college.

If the birthdates or age is not included in their profile, further search in Twitter's search bar will be conducted. The keywords that will be used are @username plus "birthday", "ulang tahun", "kuliah", etc. to know that the users' age is within the range. Interview method is also used in this research as source for data triangulation. According to Denzin (1978), data triangulation uses as many different sources of data as possible in order to maximize the theoretical advantage. The interview contained some discussion about the result in order to get the best answer and the most reliable result of the study.

The tweets that fulfil the criteria were copied and grouped according to the popular tweet where the data were taken. After that, the interviews were done through a voice call and text messages in Direct Message on Twitter and WhatsApp. For the interviews through voice call, the call was recorded and transcribed before being translated to English. Meanwhile, the answers from the interviews through Direct Messages or WhatsApp were copied and then translated into English. The interviews consist of 7 main questions. Those questions are listed below.

1. Why do you use the term as address terms?
2. What kind of impression do you want to show from the use of the term?
3. Do you understand the meaning of the term?
4. From where do you know the term?
5. To whom do you use the term?
6. Do you use this term in daily conversations?
7. Do you know the beginning of the use of this term until it is widely used by people?

Around 157 tweets were collected from 5 different tweets, related to education, by two auto-base accounts which have youth as their most audiences. Those 5 tweets were chosen since they fulfil the criteria of popular tweets stated above. The information of the tweet is as follows.

Table 3. 1. Tweet Information

Tweet	Autobase	Date	Reply	Retweet	Data Taken
Tweet 1	Autobase A	9 April 2020	3.077	4.560	59
Tweet 2	Autobase A	11 Jul 2020	836	1527	17
Tweet 3	Autobase A	8 August 2020	464	1870	22
Tweet 4	Autobase B	3 October 2020	262	1437	33
Tweet 5	Autobase B	17 September 2020	359	928	26
Σ					157

It is important to note that the reply section of Twitter only shows several relevant tweets. That is why the data taken from the tweet are limited, based on the reply that appears when the data is collected. The data taken were also filtered using the criteria above. In order to triangulate the data, six (6) people were interviewed.

3.4. Data Analysis

The collected data were grouped based on the address terms found in the tweets to see the tendency and the address terms that are most frequently used by Indonesian young users on Twitter. The data are grouped based on the types, factors, and reasons for the use of address terms. The types of address terms were taken from Pribadi (2006) study about address terms which is based on Tillitt and Bruder's (1985), Chaika's (1982), and Wardhaugh's (2006) study of address terms. The grouped data according to the types can be seen below.

Table 3. 2. Example of Data Grouped based on The Address Terms

No	Address Terms Types	Address Terms	Amount (Σ)	Percentage (%)
1	Title (T) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Title of Honorific (ToH) - Title of Occupation (ToC) 			
2	First Name (FN)			
3	Short First Name (SFN)			
4	Kinship Term (KT)			
5	Second Pronoun (P)			

Then, the data were analysed. The analysis focused on the selection of address terms and the goals of the speaker in selecting the address terms based on the form-driven analysis approach by Manns (2015) which is imbued by conversation analysis techniques. The conversation analysis technique, according to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), focuses on the production and interpretation of interaction as a well-ordered and oriented accomplishment by the participants themselves. In other words, this technique aims to unveil the production and the interpretation of conversations based on the speakers' or participants' perspectives.

The next step is analysing the address terms and identity using address terms theory by Wardhaugh (2006), framing analysis approach by Coupland (2007), and discourse analysis approach, specifically stance-taking to see the role of the users by Kiesling (2009). The collected data were analysed based on framing analysis form by Coupland (2007). According to Bucholtz & Hall (2005, p. 597), personas or identities are associated with style as a repertoire of linguistic forms, including framing. Framing uncovers the type of identity work in the conversations according to the linguistic features that the speaker uses. There are three types of framing that were used in this research; socio-cultural framing (macro-level social frames), genre framing (meso-level social frames), and interpersonal framing (micro-level social frames). Then, the address term will be analysed using stance-taking by Kiesling (2009) by explaining how stances that appear in the conversation could represent users' identities the results will be compared with several researches about Indonesian address terms (i.e. solidarity, *gaul*, etc.). The analysis also included indexicality by Bucholtz and Hall (2005 & 2007) to see the projection of identity based on the selection of address terms used in replying to the tweet. Here is the example of data analysis taken from Manns (2015, p. 80).

- Andini: *Mas, aku permisi makan ya?*
 “*Mas*, I would like to eat please?”
- Malik: *Iya, silahkan mbak.*
 “Ok, please go ahead *mbak*.”

From the example, we can see that both participants use address terms to show that they are part of a specific ethnic. Socio-cultural framing, as Coupland (2007) stated, deals with the act of identity that is related to the position that the speaker takes in order to understand the situations, gender and sexuality, and age or ethnicity. From the example above, Manns (2015) explains that Andini and Malik used symmetrical kinship terms *mbak* and *mas* to show that they are from the same age or status. *Mbak* is the shortened version of *mbakyu* which is usually addressed to unmarried women. According to Kartomihardjo (1981), *mas* and *mbak* or *mbakyu* are used among Javanese to address people equally regardless of their intimacy and status. He also adds that *mas* and *mbak* are used when the speaker is sure that the interlocutor is about the same age as the speaker. It can be concluded that the way of using *mas* and *mbak* here presents the socio-cultural frames as someone who has the same or similar age and ethnicity. Both speakers are indexing politeness and sameness since they use the same symmetrical Javanese kinship terms. Manns (2015) adds that usually the use of kinship terms is influenced by politeness in mind. However, Coupland (2007) adds the same language feature might be used to show different purposes within each frame. It also implies the less formal and less intimate conversation between them as a generic framing which, according to Coupland (2015), describes what kind of textual type or genre of the talk is understood by the speaker. With regard to the Interpersonal frame, he states that how the speaker dynamically constructed their talk and what kind of position they take in the talk regarding the relational history between the speaker and the interlocutor. Andini and Malik here show that they were taking a position as someone who has the same power and does not have a close relationship.

According to Kiesling (2009), stances connect to the way people relate to our talk and to the socialness of the talk. Manns (2015) mentions that both speakers take a stance of solidarity. In other words, both speaker and interlocutor take a stance of solidarity in order to show some respect and sameness to each other. With regards to Indexicality, Bucholtz & Hall (2005) state that identity formation in indexicality is related to ideology structure because both language and identity are rooted in culture and values that the speaker holds. The conversation between Andini and Malik shows that they are using the address terms to index Javanese

identity. Kiesling (2009) mentioned that indexicality is not directly showing the identity of the speaker. However, indexicality is one of the factors that construct the identity. The use of *mas* and *mbak* is rooted in Javanese culture which addresses *mas* and *mbak* to Javanese interlocutors as a sign that they see the interlocutor equally, regardless of the status, intimacy, and as long as the interlocutor looks slightly older or have the same age with the speaker. It can be said that the Javanese indexicality is formed by the ethnic identity that the speaker and interlocutor want to show. In other words, the use of *mas* and *mbak* here shows that the speakers want to show and identity as Javanese young people who are not close to each other.

3.5. Concluding Remark

This section covers the method used in the study, and how the address terms data collected and analysed its relation to identity. This section also describes the criteria of participants and the tweets used as the data and object of analysis. The relation frequency of the address terms used by young users in replying to popular tweets, the frame used in conversation, the index, and the stance that the speaker takes will be the main focuses in observation to seek the answers to research questions which are described in further detail on the next chapter.

