

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter III explains the method that used for conducting this research. It discusses more detailed consideration of the research method, source of data and data, data collection procedure, data analysis technique, and table of analysis of this study.

3.1 Research Method

This study use content analysis method which based on qualitative research. According to Krippendorff (2004: 18), content analysis is a research technique for making reliable and valid inferences from texts (or meaningful matter) to the context of their use. It means that content analysis deals with the presence of certain concept of the text, in this case is interactive and interactional metadiscourse in the Obama's speech. Content analysis also refer to "any technique for the classification of the sign-vehicles, which comes from the judgement of the researcher to find the categories on the basis of explicit formulated rules" (Ryan, 2014:23). In other word, this method provided with the researcher's judgement that regarded as the reports of a scientific observer. In this study, the content analysis method concerns in quantifying and analyzing the presence of interactive and interactional metadiscourse in Obama's speech and end in creating inferences. Thus, this methodology is suitable to be applied in this

study in order to find out the information of the usage of interactive and interactional metadiscourse in Obama's speech.

3.2 Source of the data and data

The source of data of this study is video of Barack Obama's speech at University of Indonesia with a duration lasting longer than 30 minutes. The data itself is Obama's speech transcript at University of Indonesia. The transcript was taken from the website <http://www.whitehouse.gov> in November 2010.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

In order to collect the data, in this case is Obama's speech transcript in University of Indonesia, the researcher did the steps as follow:

1. Finding the transcript of Obama's speech in University of Indonesia from the trusted source,
2. Reading the transcript thoroughly,
3. Identifying the words, phrases, and sentences which indicate metadiscourse markers by using Hyland (2005) taxonomy of metadiscourse.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The data which are the transcript of Obama’s UI speech was analyzed through some steps as follow:

1. Classifying the words, and phrases in the transcript based on its category and type by using Hyland (2005) model of metadiscourse (see figure 1),
2. Calculating the frequency of metadiscourse markers in each type and determine which types have the highest percentage
3. Interpretating the function in each type of metadiscourse
4. Drawing a conclusion based on the analysis.

Figure 1. A Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005:49)

Category	Function	Examples
Interactive	Help to guide the reader through the text	Resources
Transitions	Express relations between main clues	In addition; but; thus; and
Frame markers	Refer to discourse act, sequences of stages	Finally; to conclude; my purpose is;
Endophoric markers	Refer to information in other parts of the text	Noted above; see fig; in section 2
Evidentials	Refer to information from other text	According to X; z states
Code glosses	Elaborate propositional meanings	Namely; such as; in other words
Interactional	Involve the reader in the text	Resources
Hedges	Withhold commitment and open dialogue	Might; perhaps; possible; about
Boosters	Emphasize certainty or close dialogue	In fact; definitely; it is clear that
Attitude markers	Express writer’s attitude to proposition	Unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly
Self mentions	Explicit reference to author(s)	I; we; my; me; our
Engagement markers	Explicitly build relationship with receiver	Consider; note; you can see that

Table of Analysis

1. Interactive Metadiscourse

a. Transition markers

No.	Transition Markers	Frequency

b. Frame markers

No.	Frame markers	Frequency

c. Endophoric markers

No.	Endophoric markers	Frequency

d. Evidentials markers

No.	Evidentials markers	Frequency

e. Code glosses markers

No.	Code glosses markers	Frequency

Type of Interactive Metadiscourse	Number of term	Percentage of total interactive metadiscourse resources	Percentage of total metadiscourse resources
Transition markers			
Frame markers			
Code glosses markers			
Evidential markers			
Total			

2. Interactional Metadiscourse

a. Hedge markers

No.	Hedge markers	Frequency

b. Booster markers

No.	Booster markers	Frequency

c. Attitude markers

No.	Attitude markers	Frequency

d. Self mention markers

No.	Self mention markers	Frequency

e. Engagement markers

No.	Engagement markers	Frequency

Type of Interactional Metadiscourse	Number of term	Percentage of total interactional metadiscourse resources	Percentage of total metadiscourse resources
Transition markers			
Frame markers			
Code glosses markers			
Evidential markers			
Total			