

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the methodology used in this research. It contains the method of the study, data collection including sample and procedures of the research, and data analysis.

3.1 Method of the Study

This present study focuses on the phenomenon of repairs both in a news interview and a casual conversation in television programs. Specifically, it investigated the repairing patterns and the reasons for producing repairs both in those two conversational settings. In addition, this study was conducted to examine the similarities and differences of repairing patterns both in a news interview and a casual conversation in television programs.

This study employs a descriptive method that is qualitative in nature. I decided to choose this method because I attempted to discover how the participants both in a news interview and a casual conversation in television programs repair the problems in speaking that arise in the interaction. I also used qualitative method to examine whether there were similarities and differences of repairing patterns both in those two conversational settings. In addition, this method can describe and illustrate

the phenomenon of repairs both in a news interview and a casual conversation on TV in a systematic, factual and accurate way, as suggested by Nazir (2005).

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 Sample

This study uses purposive sampling to select the sample of the study. This strategy was applied in order to gain effective and important information needed to fulfill the aims of the study.

The sample of this study was an interview that involved an interviewer and interviewees in “*Today’s Dialogue*” program on *Metro TV* for a news interview. In addition, I investigated an interview that involved a host and guest stars in “*Dorce Show*” program on *Trans TV* for a casual conversation. In “*Today’s Dialogue*” program on *Metro TV*, there were five (5) participants involved: a news presenter as the moderator of the program and four (4) interviewees with different backgrounds. While “*Dorce Show*” program on *Trans TV* involved seven (7) participants: a host and six (6) guest stars with different backgrounds as well. The details information of the sample of the research is given in Table 3.1.

These programs were chosen for the present study based on several reasons. First, these programs were aired at a prime time, namely, a time where people mostly were not in a busy situation. Second, these programs involved some participants that enable the occurrences of problems in speaking, hearing and understanding because they talked more to give their opinions, ideas, or comments toward certain discussion

topics. Thus, repairs are important mechanisms needed to handle the problems in expressing or interpreting the meaning in the conversation (Scehglhoff et al., 2002). A detailed collection of the sample of the study is given in the table below:

Table 3.1 Sample of the study

	News Interview	Casual Conversation
Name of the Program	Today's Dialogue (Metro TV)	Dorce Show (Trans TV)
Schedule of the Program	22.30-23.30 WIB	09.30-10.30 WIB
News presenter / Host	Kania Sutisnawinata	Dorce Gamalama
Interviewees / guest stars	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rizal Malarangeng (Executive Director of Freedom Institute) 2. Henri Saparini (Managing Director Econit) 3. Erwin Aksa (National Chairman of HIPMI) 4. Tun Kelana Jaya (Economist of Syariah) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yudika Idol (singer) 2. Uli Aliani (actress) 3. Benu Bilalahi (presenter) 4. Alvin-TANGGA (singer) 5. Ibu Suprihatin (housewife) 6. Ibu Inong (Doctor)

3.2.2 Procedures

3.2.2.1 Recording

In this study, the data were recorded through audio-recordings. I used audio-recordings because I investigated direct observations of a natural interaction. I observed conversational events directly in *Today's Dialogue* and *Dorce Show* programs. In addition, as suggested by Clayman and Heritage (2002), recordings have

an additional advantage because they can be transcribed in detail, shared with other researchers, and even reproduced in the final research report.

This study records only one session for each program because it is considered to be adequate to analyze the phenomenon of repairing patterns both in a news interview and a casual conversation in television programs. “*Today’s Dialogue*” program on *Metro TV* for a news interview and “*Dorce Show*” program on *Trans TV* for a casual conversation were recorded by using *TP-VA 300 AIWA* micro-cassette recorder. The duration of each program was 60 minutes.

3.2.2.2 Transcribing

The recorded data were further transcribed for the analysis. By making a transcription, I was in the position to give the details of the investigated interaction. Clayman and Heritage (2002) state that printed transcripts have a function as concrete illustrations of the research. In this way, transcripts also provide readers with independent access to the events investigated, so they can check the researcher’s work related to the issue investigated. In addition, the readers can check the transcript of the data to evaluate the researcher’s analysis. The transcripts of the audio-recordings are presented in Appendix 4 and 5.

3.3 Data Analysis

The analysis of the transcribed conversation involves the following steps.

3.3.1 Identification and Categorization of Repairs

From the transcribed conversations, I identified any problems in speaking produced by the participants both in the news interview and the casual conversation in the *Today's Dialogue* and *Dorce Show* programs. Those problems can be indicated by some clues. First, when the participants replaced directly the problematic utterance with the right one. Second, the participants repeated part of the utterance that need to be repaired. Third, they abruptly stopped speaking. Fourth, they used the expression such as “*eh..*” or “*artinya*”. The last is when another speaker asked a question to his interlocutors.

After identifying any problems in speaking based on several clues previously said, I classified those problems into repairing categories mentioned by Finnegan (1992). As previously stated in Chapter II, there are four possibilities of repairs: *self-initiated and self repair; other-initiated and self-repair; self-initiated and other-repair; and other-initiated and other-repair.*

Furthermore, I identified the reasons for producing repairs based on the problems previously discovered. In general, there are four reasons for producing repairs mentioned by Finnegan (1992); they are *the speaker realizes he has made a mistake; the speaker cannot think of the correct word; speaker 2 wishes to correct a factual error made by speaker 1; and speaker 2 has not heard or understood the speaker's 1 utterance.*

3.3.2 Quantification and Interpretation

After identifying and classifying the repairing patterns and the reasons for producing repair, they were compared to find out the similarities and differences of repairing patterns in those two conversational settings.

The occurrences of those aspects were interpreted and presented both in numerical amounts and percentage. The percentage is based on the formula suggested by Hach & Farhady (1982), as cited in Suprihatin (2004) as follows:

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100 \%$$

P: percentage

f: frequency of phenomenon

n: total of phenomenon

This formula was used to find out the tendency of each aspect analyzed in this study: the repairing patterns, the reasons for producing repairs, the similarities and differences of repairing patterns both in a news interview and a casual conversation in television programs.