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# ABSTRACT

**Background and Purpose:** Write the background and purpose of your study here. The background of study usually problematizes the status quo to justify the need for the proposed research. Do not forget that you should also include the purpose of the study which is usually broader than your specific research objectives. \*\*This structured abstract is only for ORIGINAL research article. REVIEW articles can provide unstructured abstract\*\*

**Methodology:** Write your research methodology here. It cannot be too general, such as “This study employed semi-structured interviews to generate data”. It needs to be more specific as this abstract should be able to stand alone. Basically you need to make it clear - How were the data generated? Who were the participants/ respondents, and how many of them? How was sampling carried out? How did you analyse the data?

**Findings:** State the key findings here. Do not be too brief in your explanation. You should make full use of 250 word limit allowed by Jonus for this abstract.

**Contributions:** State the significance/contributions of your study here. Why should people care about the findings that you have shared in this paper?

**Keywords:** Write five keyword, as shown here: Social support, Malaysian English language teacher, Facebook Timeline, co-construction, discursive identity.

**Cite as:** Include ‘How to Cite’ information here. It should be in APA 6th edition style. For instance: Abdul Malek, J., Lim, S., & Tahir, Z. (2019).Understanding the issues of citizen participation.  *Journal of Nusantara Studies, 4*(1), 1-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol4iss1pp1-22

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Teaching is a challenging profession. Teachers across the world need support as they ‘grapple with the immense emotional, intellectual and social demands’ of the job and cope with ‘ongoing government reforms and social movements’ (Day, Kington, Stobart and Sammons, 2006, p.614). Unfortunately, the strong need for social support and guidance is not always adequately met by existing sources of support.

1. **LITERATURE REVIEW**
   1. **Taxonomy of social support**

There are two dichotomies of support in the social support literature, structural versus functional support and emotional versus instrumental (tangible) support (Beehr and Glazer, 2001). The taxonomy of social support is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Table format in JONUS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Title | Author | Publication | Year |
| 1 | A Day at The Market (*Market*) | Becka Rus | Penerbit Enam | 2012 |
| 2 | The Greedy Cat (*Cat*) | Maria Kay | Mostgain Resources Publications | 2010 |
| 3 | The Buffalo and The Tiger (*Buffalo*) | Akmar Effendi | Junior Pages Publication | 2010 |
| 4 | Helping Flood Victims (*Flood*) | - | Early Learner Publications Sdn Bhd | 2005 |

1. **RESEARCH DESIGN**

This study employed a broadly ethnographic qualitative approach and closely focused on the participants’ unfolding discourse as they interact on Timelines. To some extent, the ethnographic approach employed in this study can be associated with ‘linguistic ethnography’ (Wetherell, 2007; Copland and Creese, 2015) since it closely focuses on the discursive behaviour of the participants. As highlighted by Wetherell (2007), linguistic ethnography ‘brings together [linguistic and ethnographic approaches], in the same analytic space [to] study the discursive patterns found in everyday interactions and aims to situate these in the dynamics of wider cultural settings’ (p.661).

Figure 1: Insert your figure

One possible way to obtain support is by engaging in social networking sites (SNS), such as Facebook and Twitter, which have opened up new opportunities for all manner of people - including teachers - to communicate with each other (Rashid and Rahman, 2014). This communication includes seeking advice and information through the means of an online support community.

1. **ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

The analysis of teaching-related Status updates and Comments obtained on the teachers’ Timelines reveals that the teachers go through two simultaneous phases in the social support process: the discursive construction of shared identities and the co-construction of support. For expository clarity, we discuss these two phases separately in this section, though in reality, teachers go through these two phases repeatedly, in that they collaboratively construct and reconstruct their identities as they engage in the co-construction of support.

1. **CONCLUSION**

Co-constructing social support is a complex process. The teachers need to craft their postings carefully to encourage Friends to take up the topic they have introduced thus enabling the co-construction process to occur. The co-construction process consists of two simultaneous phases within which teachers need to find ways to fit themselves into the community to manage supportive conversations. Fitting themselves into the community is done by discursively constructing socially-acceptable identities so that they present the image of being 'one of the crowd’.
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