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ABSTRACT

Hermansyah, Mahbub. 2013. Preferred and Dispreferred Responses in the Dialogues of Junior High School’s Electronic English Books. Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Sarjana Degree of English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Airlangga University Surabaya

This study analyzed some English textbooks' dialogues of two Junior High School's electronic books (BSE) from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id English in Focus for Grade VII, VIII, and IX. Those textbooks are commonly known as Buku Sekolah Elektronik (BSE) or Electronic Books (E-Books). E-Books were officially launched by Indonesia Government in 2008 as the new innovation to provide textbooks in the form of softcopy especially for teachers and students in Indonesia. It is aimed to make Indonesian teacher and student able tp download them freely and easily. However, as the mostly used English textbooks in teaching-learning, the dialogues in those textbooks reveal some inaccuracies. In doing the analysis, Conversation Analysis (CA) is used as the parameter. CA itself is the area of discourse examining the problems and phenomena that occur in conversation properties in a variety of setting and contexts. The focus of this study is on the accuracy of talk involves preferred and dispreferred responses in four action sequences: invitations, offers, requests, and apologies in those two textbooks. The results of this study is the writer concludes that most of the problems are the dialogues do not show natural conversation and because those dialogues do not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of The Study

English is one of the compulsory subjects in Indonesian Junior High School. The reasons are: first, English becomes one of the subjects that is examined in UN (Ujian Negara), which is used as the requirement of Indonesian students' graduation; second, Indonesian students are expected to comprehend and use English as their international language that is mainly used for both educational and professional purposes. Due to the fact, nowadays English is taught as early as possible in Indonesian schools. It is aimed to prepare the students to face the globalization era and participate in the modernization of science and technology which is commonly discussed or written in English.

Concerning the fact that English has become more important and common in every corner of the globe, Indonesian students are expected to have a good skill in English. In order to meet these needs, the students have to be prepared both practically and academically. As Richards and Rogers (1991, p.14) says that the quality of language teaching concerning how languages are learned, how knowledge of language is presented and organized in memory. Therefore, the students can be said to have master good English when they achieve good scores academically and could apply their knowledge practically in their daily lives.
The success in the students' academic performance can be reached if they get good assessment from their teachers. Otherwise, the success in students' practice can be seen from how fluent the students communicate in English according to the language use. Moreover, Gattegno (1992) says that learning language is not seen as the means of accumulating knowledge but as the means of becoming proficient learner in whatever one is engaged in. In addition, Richards and Rogers (1991, p. 23) states that proficient learner is defined as processor, performer, initiator, and problem solver. For example, students are expected to have a good performance anytime they have to interact with others. This means that communicating in English appropriately is very important. This also includes paying attention to the norms when communicating with others (e.g. native speaker). Doing so will make the students become more aware of when and where they should use their knowledge.

Learning about American/British norms in English language is considered important for Indonesian people since Indonesia is not an English- speaking country. Although, some people may think that it does not matter for them to communicate with the Indonesian style of English because they do not always meet and socialize with the native speakers. However, teaching English by adopting American! British norms is still significant. As Celce (1995), says that when teaching English, people need to understand all aspects in English not only the grammatical or linguistic one but also everything else including sociocultural, discourse, actional, and strategic competence. Further, Speece (2002) argues that cultural awareness
is usually considered important for teacher and learner in studying foreign language. Thus, adapting sociocultural norms of American or British in teaching English may support the purpose of teaching English communicatively.

It is believed that learners learn from the teachers, from other students, and from other teaching sources. The form of teaching materials can be gotten from any other sources for example, textbook, audiovisuals, and computer software. Moreover, Putri (2007) says that Indonesian people depend on the textbooks when they are learning English. Therefore, English textbooks (hardcopy/ softcopy) may become one of the domain sources in teaching-learning in Indonesia. Textbooks are considered of having a great impact in affecting student's evaluation and assumption towards certain idea. Morris (1996) states that although teachers had previously attempted to make EFL classrooms more "communicative" through the addition of "communicative activities", it was apparent that teachers felt that they centered on textbook.

Regarding that textbooks become important in affecting students' perception toward certain idea, textbooks have to provide the accurate materials. Realizing that textbooks are written by the textbooks' writers, Wong (2002) assumes that the material written in the textbooks can not be said as authentic material. However, English textbooks should provide the authentic materials or at least based on the real language (Betsy, 2004, p.223). This is actually in line with Communicative Language Teaching
(CLT) which is believed as an appropriate approach that can make students actively use English in their daily lives.

The basic of the CLT approach is on "meaningful" communication which is considered as more natural or "authentic" way of learning another language (Carpenter-Moon, 2000, p. 43). Further, Betsy (2004, p.31) says that one of several keys principle of CLT is authentic materials. Therefore, the uses of accurate textbooks that are based on authentic language in CLT classes also play a role in teaching-learning process. This means that textbooks are some of the main source to provide appropriate materials in reaching the goal of teaching English communicatively. Thus, it becomes a problem when the dialogues written in textbooks appear to be different from the aims of the studying dialogue itself. However, some English dialogues written in textbooks may not accurate enough.

Therefore, the writer is interested in analyzing some English textbooks' dialogues of three Junior High School's electronic books (BSE) from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id English in Focus for Grade VII, Grade VIII, and Grade IX. Those textbooks are commonly known as Buku Sekolah Elektronik (BSE) or Electronic Books (E-Books). E-Books were officially launched by Indonesia Government on 2008 as the new innovation to provide textbooks in the form of softcopy especially for teachers and students in Indonesia. It is aimed that every Indonesian teacher and student can download it freely and easily. However, as the mostly used English textbooks in teaching-learning, the dialogues in those textbooks reveal some inaccuracies.
In doing the analysis, Conversation Analysis (CA) is used as the parameter. This is done because CA is the study of talking interaction and one approach used in the study of conversation (Schegloff, 2007, p. 1). "CA uses naturally occurring data to identify organization of talking which is helpful in teaching English particularly oral language" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 2). Additionally, Wong (2002) states the mismatch between textbooks and naturally occurring language has implications for teachers and the writers of teaching material, especially since dialogues of the short analyzed frequently appear in textbooks marketed as offering, authentic, natural language, or language which is true to life.

CA itself is the area of discourse examining the problems and phenomena that occur in conversation properties in a variety of setting and context. The task of CA is to explain the meaning of talk in natural interaction. Therefore, CA is used as an analysis to observe the way of the participants categorize their interaction systematically in solving their problem of talking. Here, analysis of the preference structure in English textbooks dialogues used as the example in order to measure the accuracy as the data found in CA theory.

The focus of this thesis is on the accuracy of talk involves preferred and dispreferred responses in four action sequences: invitations, offers, requests, and apologies in those three textbooks. Preferred and dispreferred response discussed in this thesis involve turn taking in adjacency pairs which is composed for the first pair part and second pair part and related to each other (Putri, 2007). Here, positive responses such as acceptances,
grantings, and agreements will be categorized as preferred responses while negative responses such as rejections, declining, and disagreements will be categorized as dispreferred responses (Schegloff, 2007, p. 60).

Further, the analysis of the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred responses will determine the accuracy of the English dialogues written in the textbooks. These characteristics are different in many ways. There are two main characteristics of preferred response: simple and no delay. Besides, there are four characteristics of dispreferred response: mitigation and elaboration, delay, preemptive reformulation with preference reversal, and Performa agreement. Thus, by analyzing the preferred and dispreferred responses in English dialogue written in textbooks, it will reveal how accurate the three textbooks examined.

There were five studies found related to the issue concerning a conversation analysis in English textbooks dialogues. The four related studies examined the relation between dialogues in ESL/EFL textbooks and organization of talk related to the CA. The first study was one that was conducted by Wong (2002) compared the structure of telephone conversations in ESL textbooks with another found in CA research. Second, Bernsten (2002) used conversation analysis to evaluate pre-sequences in invitation, offer, and request dialogues in ESL textbooks. Next, Putri (2007) examined the preferred and dispreferred responses in four actions sequences from the eleven ESL/ EFL text books in pre- intermediate through advanced levels in Indonesia and or other Southeast Asian Countries. Gresti (2009) proved that some dialogues in textbooks used by students at seven grades in
Junior High School did not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred responses. Last, Nidia (2009) analyzed some English textbooks' dialogues of three Senior High School's electronic books (BSE) from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id Developing English Competencies for Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII. Basically, the five studies evaluated some ways in which textbooks conversations failed to match the finding from CA. However, in this thesis the writer focuses on analyzing the preferred and dispreferred responses in four action sequences found in the three English electronic books that are mostly used by Junior High School's teachers and students in Indonesia.

1.2. **Statement of The Problem**

The problem that will be analyzed in this thesis is: Are preferred and dispreferred responses accurately presented in invitation, request, offer, and apology dialogues? according to the characteristics described in Conversation Analysis by Schegloff.

1.3. **Objectives of Study**

The objective of this study is to analyze whether preferred and dispreferred responses are accurately presented in invitation, request, offer, and apology dialogues? according to the characteristics described in Conversation Analysis by Schegloff.
1.4. Significance of The Study

The writer hopes that the results can give a considerable contribution to ELT (English Language Teaching in Indonesia) as a reference for the readers, students, and teachers in Indonesia. Besides, the writer also hopes that this study can be used as a reference for those who wish to investigate this topic further.

1.5. Definition of Key Terms

- Dialogues : The commonest form of spoken communication (Cox, 2006, p.66).
- Preferred Response : +Response (acceptance, granting, etc) (Schegloff, 2007)
- Dispreferred Response : -Response (rejections, declining, etc) (Schegloff, 2007)
- Electronic Book : Other form of textbooks (softcopy) that is downloaded from www.bse.depdknas.go.id
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis is known as one of approaches that are usually used as the study of talking and interaction in all kinds of conversation (Schegloff, 2007). It gives a particular attention to everyday spoken interaction such as casual conversation, chat, and ordinary narratives (Paltridge, 2000. P.83). Psathas (1995) also states that CA is the study that concerns with ordinary social interactions which has been developed in the form of systematic procedures as a tool for studying those interactions.

The organizations of talk or conversation (whether ‘informal’ or ‘formal’) was never the central, defining focus in CA. Rather it is the organization of meaningful conduct of people in society, that is, how people in society produce their activities and make sense of the world about them (Pomerantz and Fehr, 2000). In addition, Pomerantz and Fehr (2000, p.65) merely claim that the analytic approach of CA is not limited to an explication of talk alone but is amenable to analyses of how conduct, practice, or praxis, in whatever form, is accomplished. Studies within this tradition which focus on talk view talk, nonetheless, as social action. In short, CA can be derived from sociology and known as ethno methodology. As sacks, Schegloff, and Jeffersoon (1974) say that conversation has its own dynamic structure and rules, and the methods used by speakers to efficiently structure the conversation. It can be concluded that the proper object of
sociology study is a set of technique that the members of the society themselves use to interpret and act within their own social worlds to all forms of talking in interaction.

2.2 Preferred and Dispreferred Responses

The two terms here must be seen as referring to structural relationship of sequence parts (Schegloff, 2007). Furthermore, Schegloff: (2007) says that it is not a matter of "motives or desires or likings of the participants, whether speakers or recipients" (p.61). For example, an acceptance for an invitation to a party as a preferred response is not affected by the fact that the speakers like the recipient or not, whether he/ she prefers the recipient to come to the party or not. No matter what a personal predilection of the speaker is, whereas refusal is the dispreferred one (Levinson, 1983; Heritage, 1984).

Characteristics of Preferred Responses

There are two groups of features which can be used to recognize the preferred response: simple and no delay (Schegloff, 2007). In terms of position, for example, it is delivered in a "normal" way which means that they come right away after the first pair part. Further, Schegloff (2007) adds that "preferred responses are likely to be short and to the point, and not ordinarily treated as 'accountable" (p. 66). The characteristic of preferred responses according to CA is drawn from the example below.

(Levinson, 1983, p.307)

1  Child  :  Could you .hh could you put on the
2        :  Light for my .hh room
3 Father  :⇒ yep
Characteristics of Dispreferred Responses

There are several features presented to identify the accuracy of dispreferred response. Schegloff (2007) categorizes some cluster of features which can be used to recognize the dispreferred responses such as mitigation, elaboration, default, and positioning. Similar features are also presented by Levinson (1983) which incorporate delays, preface, accounts; and declination components as the signs of dispreferred responses.

Mitigation and Elaboration

Dispreferred responses are mostly mitigated or attenuated (Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, dispreferred responses are more elaborated than the preferred one. Therefore, there are two clusters for the dispreferred responses to be mitigated and elaborated:

1. Accounts: - formulated explanation for why the (dispreferred) act is being done (Levinson, 1083).
2. Prefaces: a. the use of markers or annunciers like *Uh* or *Well*.
   b. Appreciation (It is very sweet of you).
   c. Apologies (I'm sorry).
   d. Disclaimer Q don't know) etc.

(Schegloff, 2007; Levinson, 1983)

Besides, the prefaces above can also be considered as delays since they avoid the response from being contiguous with its first pair part.
Delay

Dispreferred responses usually come with a delay (Schegloff, 2007). In terms of position, the delays commonly exist as:

a. Inter-turn gap: silence gap between first pair part and second pair part which breaks the contiguity of them (Putri, 2007, p 14).

b. Turn-Initial delay: delays in the initial position of the second turn which can be pause, discourse markers (e.g., *Uuh, Well*), or hedges (e.g. *Idunno*). They delay the second pair part within the turn (Putri, 2007, p.14).

c. Insertion sequences: another sequence between first pair part and second pair part in base sequence. The insertion is needed so that the second pair part speaker can receive information that is necessary for giving a response to the first part speaker. Examples of insertion sequence are another question after a question as first pair part or a question after an invitation.

The example of mitigation and elaboration dialogue:

(Schegloff, 2007, p65)

1 Emma : wanna c'mdo:wn 'ay [a bah:ta] lunch
2 with me?=
3 Nan : ['It's is] ( )°
4 Emma : =Ah gut s'm beer'n stu:ff,
5 → (0.3)
6 Nan : → 'Wul yer ril sweet hon: uh:m
7 (,)
8 Emma : [or d'y]ou'av sup'n [else°( )°
9 Nan : → [L e t-] I : ] hu. [n:No: I haf to: uh
10 call] Roul's mother, I told'er I:d call'er
11 this morning I [gotta letter]=
12 Emma : [° (Uh huh.) 0] =
13 Nan : =from' er en . ahhhhhh A: nd uhm
(1.0)
In the extract above, the examples of mitigation and elaboration (account and appreciation), and inter-turn gap are shown by the arrows. Line 5 and 7 are examples of inter-turn gap, line 6 are appreciation; while line 9, 10, 11, 13 show an account.

Preemptive reformulation with preferences reversal

According to Putri (2007, p.15), it is common for speakers to recognize the signs of an upcoming dispreferred response and then try to reformulate the first pair part so that the preference organization for the second pair part is reversed. Before the dispreferred response comes, the speakers reformulate the turn so the second pair part parts of dispreferred response can be said in a preferred way. In addition, Schegloff (2007) says, "The first pair part speaker talks again, and in affect re-asks the question with reversed preference". In doing so, the speaker can avoid face-threat by giving the second pair part speaker chance in saying the dispreferred response in a preferred way.

The example of preemptive reformulation with preference reversal:

(Schegloff, 2007, p.65)

1  Emma :  [wanna c'm] do:wn ‘ay [a bah:ta] lunch
2  with me?=  
3  Nan :  ["It's is] (  
0  )
4  Emma :  =Ah gut s'm beer'n stu:ff,
5  → (0.3)
6  Nan :  → ;Wul yer ril sweet hon: uh:m
7  → (.)
8  Emma :  [or d'y]ou'ay sup'n [else°( )  
0  ]
9  Nan :  → [L e t-] I : ] hu. [n:No: I haf to: uh
10  call] Roul's mother, I told'er I:d
11  call'er this morning I [gotta letter]=
12  Emma :  [F (Uh huh.)°)=
13  Nan :  =from'er en .ahhhhh A:nd uhm
14  (1.0)
In line 7, Emma reformulated her invitation because she saw the signs of dispreferred response (line 5,6,7) with the previous one. In line 41, Emma elaborated her invitation by explaining what she had that might attract Nan. However since there were some silences in line 5 and 7, and an appreciation for the invitation which was prefaced by a turn-initial delay well in line 6, she repeats her invitation appeal by asking if Nan had something else to do that would prevent her from accepting the invitation. Given this question, Nan could ease the burden of refusing the invitation by answering the question and giving an account for why she could not accept the invitation.

'Pro forma' agreement

As Putri states, pro forma agreement is a combination of agreement + disagreement. However, the agreement to the first pair part is shown as delay, (therefore, it may also be included in the 'delay' characteristic) to dispreferred response. It means that there is no silence there, but it delays the actual dispreferred response. Therefore, it is common to see combinations like "yes, but..." etc (2007, p.15-16).

The extract below shows an example of 'pro forma' agreement where first B's response seems to agree with A but then combined with except which actually shows disagreement.

(Sacks 1987 [1973] p.63)

1  A :  'N they haven't heard a word huh?
2  B :  → Not a word, uh-uh. Not-not a word. Not at all.
3  → Except- Neville's mother got a call
2.3 Action Sequences

*Invitation*

Invitations are actions commonly found in real-life conversations. It is about requesting somebody, to do something or to go somewhere. As a way to socialize with others, it is understandable that inviting people and knowing how to do it appropriately is important (Putri, 2007, p.16).

We may consider that it is very important to discuss pre-invitations as one form of pre-sequence before explaining more about the preferred and dispreferred responses of the invitations. Pre-sequences can come before different kinds of first pair parts such as: invitation, offer, request, etc. As Schegloff (2007, pp. 28-29) says "preliminaries that project such specific imminent First Pair Parts (FPPs) are called type specific pre-sequences". These types of pre-sequences are used in an attempt to avoid dispreferred response. In other words, a pre-sequence lets the co-participant know that a FPP proposing an action sequence like invitation may be coming. In addition, Schegloff (2007) states that "There are two functions of pre-invitation: to project the possibilities that a base FPP (invitation) will be produced and also it makes it relevant next the production of second pair part (response to pre-invitation)" (p.29). Some examples of pre-invitation would be "what are you doing this weekend?' or "are you doing anything?'". Therefore, pre-invitation cannot be separated from the invitations, since they are as important as invitations themselves.

There are three types of pre-invitations of responses: go-ahead, hedging, and blocking responses (Schegoiff, 2007). A go-ahead response
encourages the speaker to produce the relevant FP of the base adjacency pairs.

The example of go-ahead response to a pre-invitation:

(Schegloff, 2007, p.24)

(Nelson is the caller; Clara is called to the phone)
1 Clara : Hello
2 Nelson : Hi.
3 Clara : Hi.
4 Nelson : What's up?
5 Clara : Not much.
6 Nelson : Y' wanria drink?
7 Clara : Yeah.
8 Nelson : Okay.

Nelson does a pre-invitation with "What's up" in line 4 and Clara responds with "Not much" in line 5. Therefore, Nelson takes this as evidence that his invitation will be accepted and produces the FPP "Y' wanna drink?".

As Nelson could predict from Clara's response, he gets a preferred response and invitation is accepted.

On the contrary, a blocking response can discourage the production of relevant FPP.

The example of blocking response to a pre-invitation:

(Schegloff, 2007, p.30)

(SB, 1, Allen and Judy are married; John is Judy's fellow student)
1 Allen : Hello?
2 John : Yeah, is Judy there?
3 Allen : Yeah, just a second.
4 (( ))
5 Judy : Hello,
6 John : Judy?
7 Judy : Yeah,
8 John : John Smith.
9 Judy : Hi John.
10 John : Ha you doin-<say what 'r you doing.
11 Judy : Well, we're going out.
John does a pre-invitation in line 10. Schegloff (2007, p. 30) explains "the caller asks just as at the possible end of the opening (after the greeting exchange) what the recipient is doing, and this is a way of doing a pre-invitation)." After John's pre-invitation in line 10, Judy responds in line 11 with "Well, we're going out". This shows that Judy is not available to accept an invitation, which potentially blocks the invitation.

In addition, there is also a hedging response to a pre-invitation such as "Why,uhm-possibly" (Schegloff, 2007). When a recipient responds to a FPP of a pre-sequence with "why", they are showing that they recognize the talk which is related to a projected F!!), but their response will depend on the invitation, offer, and request. Further, a hedging response can come in the form of combination of response types.

The example of hedging response to a pre-invitation:

(Schegloff, 2007, p.31)

(SB,1 continued)

1 Judy : Hi John
2 John : Ha you doin --say what 'r you doing
3 Judy : Well we're going out. Why
4 John : I was just gonna say come out and come
5 over here and talk this evening, [but if]
6 you’re going out you can’t very welldo
7 that.
8 Judy : “Talk,” you mean get drunk, don’t
9 you?]

The first arrow in line 2,"what'r you doing", shows the pre-invitation, and the response is line 3 which is a combination of a blocking response and a hedging are similarity an invitation. This response shows what an invitation is going to be. Schegloff (2007) also concluded that the result of
pre invitations can be that no base invitation sequence is done or there is a follow up invitation sequence (p.2:8).

A preferred response to an invitation is an acceptance, while a dispreferred one is a rejection. This is because an acceptance symbolizes an alignment with the first pair part of an invitation sequence while the rejection shows a distancing from the invitation (Schegloff, 2007).

Offer

How to make an offer and how to respond an offer are important to be taught. Offer and invitation are quite same each other in which they have pre-sequences called pre-offers and they have acceptance as preferred respond and rejection as dispreferred one. In pre-offers, those who have something to offer will try to assess whether they offers will be accepted or not and that the offers will depend on the pre-offers (Schegloff, 2007). Similar to pre-invitations, pre-offers also have three kind of response: go-ahead, blocking, and hedging response.

The example of pre-offer with go-ahead response:

**Bookstore, 2,2:107** (Slieglöff, 2007, p.35)

1. Cathy : I'm gonna buy thermometer though (because I=
2. Les : [But-
3. Cathy : =think she's (got a temperature).
4. Gar : [We have a thermometer.
5. Cathy : (Yih do?)
6. Gar : Wanta use it?
7. Cathy : Yeah.
   (3.0)

The pre-offer happens in line 4 where Gar announces that he has a thermometer after Cathy's statement to buy one. This was heard by Cathy as a pre-offer and she responds to it in line 5 which was considered as go-ahead
response. The offer itself was done in line 6 where it has an acceptance as a preferred response in line 7.

The example of pre-offer with a blocking response:

Goldberg, (SchegOlff, 2007, p.36)

1 Peter : I’ll see ya tuesday
2 Marcus : Right
3 Peter : O [k a y Marcus]
4 Marcus : −[you − you’re al] right [you can get there]
5 Peter : [ye-]
6 Peter : Yeah
7 Marcus : Okay
8 Peter : okay

In the above extract, Peter and Marcus have been talking about meeting that they are going to attend. Marcus is trying to offer a ride to Peter but before he did that, he makes a pre-offer in line 4. This pre-offer gets a blocking response in line 6 in which Peter indicates that he is able to get there by himself in the meeting. Based on this response, Marcus decides not to continue with an offer.

Pre-offer is then considered very useful in deciding whether the offer can be done or not. However, the shift from pre-sequence base sequence is not always smooth (Schegloff, 2007). The extract below shows this problem.

Debby and Nick 1:2-2:59 (Schegloff, 2007, p. 36)

1 Peter : I’ll see ya tuesday
2 Marcus : Right
3 Peter : O [k a y Marcus]
4 Marcus : −[you − you’re al] right [you can get there]
5 Peter : [ye-]
6 Peter : Yeah
7 Marcus : Okay
8 Peter : okay

The above extract shows a pre-offer in line 3 which gets a blocking response in line 4. This blocking response is then repeated several times...
since Debbie kept on asking to expect a different response, a go-ahead one. However, the blocking response is still repeated and then finally in line 19 and 20, Debbie said what could have been an offer. As indicated in the blocking response to the pre-offer, this would have been an offer is rejected in line 21 and 22.

Request

A request is another type of action that has similarities with the previous two actions: invitations and offers. However, in terms of pre-sequence, a pre-request has a different preferred response In the previous actions, a preferred response to a pre- invitation or a pre-offer is a go-ahead response which then leads to the base sequence: an invitation or an offer. In pre-request, an offer would be more preferred than a go-ahead response. This different preference involves different persons, an offer by someone who has something to offer rather than a request to the potential recipient (Schegloff, 2007).

The example a pre-request elicits an offer rather than request

SBL, (Schegloff, 2007, p.91)

Beth : And uhm I have her book
(1.0)
Beth : Have you read it
Abby : I think I have seen her book, I don’t know whether I’ve read it all or not.
Beth : I believe in miracles
Abby : Yes
Beth : And uh [ (I have)
Abby : [you have it you say?
Beth : Uh I believe in Miracles
Abby : I say do you have it?
Beth : Yes
Abby : Uh huh
Beth : And I’ll be glade to (. ) let you have it (a week’r two)
Abby : Yes I’d like to
The above extract shows two pre-requests in line 9 and line 11. Before Beth does the offer, there is a token by Abby in line 13 to acknowledge the agreement to the pre-request that she did in both lines. This also indicates that Abby was orienting to an offer in line 13. She finally gets the offer in line 14 and 15. This offer gets an acceptance a prefer response in line 16.

The second next preferred response of a pre-request is a go-ahead one. If an offer is not got, a go-ahead which then leads to a request can be done.

The example of go ahead response to a pre-request:

SBL (Schegloff, 2007, p.92)

Abby : And uhm I want (ed)to ask too, do you still have a copy of the cro-ih cross and the switch blade?
Beth : Yeah.
Abby : May I read again?
Beth : Yes, you sure may, I’ve got it on my bedside and I intended to read it again myself, and I started it,
(Dialogue continued)

The above extract shows a pre-request done in line 1 until 3. It has a go-ahead response instead of an offer in line 4. This response is then followed by a base sequence, a request by FPP in line 5 and the response by SPP in line 6.

Apology

Apologies are important in maintaining social relationship with others. This action helps reestablish social harmony between speakers whenever one of the performs some actions that may cause offenses (Putri 2007, p. 23).

Robinson (2004) focuses on the sequential organizations of "explicit" apologies. He only talks about sorry-based units of talks; and offers of
apology that are different from other" offense-remedial-related' actions" like "it 's my fault", "Forgive me", "I beg your pardon "(p. 293). In describing the sequential organizations of apologies, he thuds four places where apologies can occur.

First, Robinson (2004) says that an apology can be done as "an initial turn-constructional unit of a turn that accomplishes a different action" (p. 296). In this, position, an apology, itself is subordinate to the action being pursued. There is no appropriate response to the apology in this position because the apology is just a preface to the following action and not the main action which is not necessary to be responded to (Püträ, 2007, p. 23).

The example of apology-prefaced question:

(Robinson, 2004, p. 296)

1 MOM : Wha'I'm concerned about us do I give
2 f:fluids,or
3 DOC . hhh [h Yeah.]
4 MOM : [Or what.] I just don't kno: [W.
5 DOC :-. [>.h]<]Sorry<how old is your daughter,
>did
6 - , you :sEay?<]
7 MOM : [ sh]e:'s eighteen.
8 DOC : Eightee:n.

The apology prefaced question/answer sequence begins in line 5 and ends in line 7. The apology is preliminary action to another action to another action which asking for information. The doctor apologizes because the mom might have provided the information before and so the doctor would like her to repeat the information. However, there is no response to the apology in line 6. Instead the response is directly intended to action being accomplished (answering the question in line 4 and 5).
Furthermore, Robinson (2004, p 297) states the second position in which an apology can happen is an apology as a second pair part where it is "preliminary and subordinate to the primary action of this turn". The difference from the previous position is that an apology is done as a second pair part of the adjacency pair. There is also no response to the apology because it is just preface to the responses to the first pair part. One of the examples of apology as second pair part is apology-prefaced account.

The example of an apology (SPP) as a preface of an account:

(Robinson, 2004, p. 299)

1 LES : Are you thinking (.) of coming (.) to thuh
2 meeting toni:ght.
3 MYR : >Doyou know< I'm terrible sorry.> I was

The apology as a second pair part Apology-prefaced account is in line 3. The account was a response to the question in the previous lines which was given as a sign of dispreferred response.

Third, an apology can also be done as a second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions (e.g. complaints) (Robinson, 2004).

The example of an apology (SPP) as complaint:

(Robinson, 2004, p.300)

1 GOR : Are you going' tonigh=t
2 NOR : Mn,
3 GOR : .hhh(.)Would you mind givin' me a lift=h
4 NOR : [No
5 : That's a'righ',
6 GOR : .hhh(0.2) Very kind of you
7 NOR :-- Caught me in thuh bath ag[ain,J
8 GOR : [.ph ]hhh Pardon?= 
9 NOR : = (heh) Caugh ft me in t.huh. ba [th

The apology was done in line 10 as a response to the complaint in lines 7 and 9. Here, action of apologizing is primary but there is no relevant
response to the apology itself because usually the complaint sequence ends after the apology is given (apology is a preferred response to complaints).

The fourth position is an apology as a first pair part in which apologizing is a primary action. Here, Robinson (2004) says "an apology solicits response"(p.301). There are two types of responses to this type of apology: preferred and dispreferred response. There are three types of preferred response described by Robinson. First is absolution. Second is disagreeing with the need for the apology. Last is "oh-prefaced" absolution or disagreement with the need for the apology. The first preferred response, absolution has two functions: "acknowledge commission of offense and claim that no offence was taken" (Robinson, 2004).

The example of absolution:

(Robinson, 2004 p. 299)
1 LES : Are you thinking of coming to thuh
2 meeting tonight.
3 MYR : >Do you know I'm terribly sorry.> I was
4 Going da ring you in a short while, <hh I
5 Had a phone call from Ben. (he/whose) down in 6
Devon. 'n he's not going to get back
7 Tonight, h[h
8 LES : [Yes=
9 MYR =And mommy's going to this k-k-=uh:(.)that
10 [Ca: roll [<concert>]
11 LES [(Y,-Yes] [of course] I think my husband's
12 going to that too.:=
13 MYR :- =I'm dreadfully sorry.
14 LBS :- tThat' s a' ri:ght,

The apology in line 113 is a first pair part that stands by itself and the response in line 14 is an absolution. Beside That's alright, there are some other examples of absolution like That okay or It's cool.

The next preferred responses, disagreeing with the need of apology can be seen in extract 8 which is a continuation' of the above extract.
In line 2, Les is disagreeing with the production of the apology and not to the action of apologizing itself. Les thought that Myr did not need to apologize anymore since he/she had done it before (the above extract). Therefore, Les disagrees by saying No after the Myr's apology in line 1. This is very important because if we say that the response is disagreeing with the apology (rejecting it) it would be considered to be dispreferred response. For example, if Les had said No I don't forgive you (which is very uncommon in real talk), it would have meant that Lea reject's Myr's apology. But, in this case, Les says No to refer to the need to do the apology again since Myr has done it before.

The last type of preferred response that Robinson explains is an "oh" prefaced preferred response. Robinson (2004, p. 301) mentions, "oh preface to a response to an apology can display the respondent's understanding that the action of apologizing was irrelevant or inappropriate. Some examples of this type of response is "Oh, that's okay", or "Oh, it's alright".

The most common dispreferred response that occurs is response delay, for example, silence, and well. The consequence for this response is that "the apology speaker will pursue an apology-relevant response" (p. 309).

The example of this dispreferred response is in extract below:

(Robinson, 2004, p. 309)
1 DOC :- Hello: s[orry I'm running] late.
2 PAT : [Hi:
3 -
The delay happens with a silence in 'line 3 where no apology-relevant response by giving an account' excuse. Finally, the patient responds by giving an apology-relevant response by disagreeing with the apology's claimed offense:. An actual dispreferred response where the recipient of the apology agrees with the speaker (that the offense was taken and that apology is needed) and rejects the apology rarely happens in natural occurring data. This might be related to the function of the apology itself which is to maintain a relationship. However, the actual dispreferred response could often happen to be meant as a joke and not to be taken seriously. Also, there seems to be less data of this kind of action Where people are showing serious offenses.

"Sorry" could also be used for other actions. There are two other actions which are: explained by Robinson; sorry to express personal regret or condolence as in extract line 7 below.

(Robinson, 2004, P. 317)

2.4 Review of Related Studies

The first related study was conducted by Wong (2002). In her study, she examined telephone dialogues in English as Second Language textbooks against the backdrop of what is reported about real telephone interaction in:
conversation analysis research. The result was that from eight textbooks telephone conversation found were unsatisfactory to what conversational analyst say about natural telephone conversation. Elements such as summon-answer, identification, greeting, and how-are-you sequences, which often found in naturally occurring telephone exchanges, were absent, incomplete, or problematic in textbooks. Furthermore, she argued that the mismatches between textbooks and naturally occurring language had implication for teachers and writers of teaching materials. Further, she continued her research for "how to apply" conversation analysis in applied linguistic looking to see what there is to unbundled and unbridle, to understand and appreciate, with respect to talk, language pedagogy, and the classroom context. In short, it might be important for material writers and language teachers to pay attention to interconnections between language (or talk), sequence structure, and social action.

The second related study was conducted by Bernsten (2002). In her study, she used conversation analytic research on a particular practice of organization in talk to evaluate pre-sequences in invitation, offer, and request in English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks dialogues and made recommendations for their improvement. There, she examined 68 dialogues from 22 ESL integrated: skills and conversation textbooks. Although a few textbooks contained implicit models of pre-sequences, she assumed that those textbooks lacked explicit teaching about the form and function of pre-sequences. Thus, her research suggested recommendations for teaching about pre-sequences by adapting and supplementing textbook
dialogues as well as training students to collect and analyze natural language.

The third related study was conducted by Putri (2007). In her study, she investigated the accuracy of preferred and dipreferred responses in four action sequences. The sequences discussed were invitations, offers, request, and apologies of eleven ESL textbooks mainly used in Indonesia or other Southeast Asian countries. There, she examined the accuracy of the ESL textbooks dialogues since she found that many of the dialogues lack accuracy. Furthermore, she claimed that most of the material writers only count on their native speaker intuition and the rules of written language. Moreover, she also argued that it is possible to use: CA research in order to know how teachers teaching communicative English in the EFL context like Indonesia and other Southeast Asian countries.

The fourth related study was conducted by Gresti (2009). This study discussed about four action sequences in the 7 grade Junior High School English textbooks used by SBI students in Gresik. Moreover, she concluded that mostly problems found because the dialogues did not show natural conversation. Furthermore, she argued that the dialogues in those three textbooks did not accurate enough because it did not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred responses.

Last, Nidia (2009) analyzed some English textbooks' dialogues of three Senior High School's electronic books (BSE) from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id Developing English Competencies for Grade X, Grade XI, and Grade XII.
Basically, from the previous studies above there are several similarities in those studies. All of them are conducted the analysis in English textbook dialogue. They also found many significant features that came from particular structures of talk in action sequences. Moreover, all of the studies claimed that according to Conversation Analysis (CA) literature, most of the dialogues found in English textbooks lack accurately because materials writers count on the textbooks writers' intuition and the rules of written language.

Therefore, the writer compares his analysis to the previous studies. In this study the writer focuses on the preferred and dispreferred responses in four action sequences: invitation, offer, request, and apology. This is same with the previous studies because the writer also analyzes the inaccuracy English dialogue found in three Junior High School's electronic book by using CA as the parameter. Even though there are many similarities from the previous studies, the result would be different because different object. Further, the writer's study focuses on the English dialogues of Junior High School's electronic books downloaded from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id. Those are the other form of textbooks (softcopy) which has been introduced by Indonesian Government in 2008. Thus, almost all of the Indonesian people especially teachers and students are able to download the electronic books freely and easily. Moreover, the writer found that the qualities of those textbooks needed to be revised more since there were still found grammatical mistakes and inaccuracy in English dialogues. However, this study is only focused on to the structure of talk in preferred and dispreferred
responses found in English Dialogues of Junior High School's electronic books. Therefore, the result will reveal how accurate those three electronic books examined.
CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY

3.1 Research Approach

In this study, the writer applies qualitative approach, since one of the features of qualitative research proposed by Bogdan (1992, p.30) is that qualitative is descriptive. It is appropriate with the aim of this study, which is to analyze the preferred and dispreferred responses in the dialogues of Junior High School's electronic books. According to Merriam (1998, p.17), qualitative research is descriptive when the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures. It is suitable for this study, since this study is aimed to describe and explain the process, meaning, and understanding the structure of talks found in the data.

3.2 Corpus

The corpuses of this study were some electronic books which were used in Senior High School. It is chosen to be analyzed as the representation of the textbooks that are mostly used by Junior High School education practitioners in Indonesia. It can be downloaded from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id. Finally, the writer chosen only three electronic books and examined them.
The examined electronic books are:


The writer read all the three electronic books dialogues and selected some of dialogues that contain four action sequences: invitation, request, offer, and apology.

3.3 Technique of Data Collection

In collecting the data, the writer did several steps. First, the writer searched www.bse.depdiknas.go.id. Second, if the writer wanted to download the material, the writer had to log in and fulfill the personal data that was required in order to get the password. Then, after the writer got the password, the writer finally could download the material freely. Finally, the result of those materials were saved in PDF file.

3.4 Technique of Data Analysis

After getting the complete data, the writer analyzed them by using Conversation Analysis theory by Schegloff as the parameter to analyze the
accuracy of dialogues in those three electronic books. The writer examined dialogues from the three electronic books above. The writer classified some dialogues that contain invitation, request, offer, and apology sequences. Then, the dialogues would be analyzed according to preference structure based on the procedure of CA. In doing the analysis, the writer presented the dialogues with preferred and dispreferred responses and analyzed them according to the characteristics that were produced and absent.

In short, the steps in analyzing the data are as the following:

1. Find out the dialogues which contain of four action sequences.
2. Grouping the four action sequences.
3. Analyzing the data using Conversation Analysis (CA) theory.
4. Making conclusion of the findings.
CHAPTER IV
TEXTBOOKS ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the data and its analysis are presented. The writer presents the dialogues that have been analyzed from the electronic books used in Junior High Schools for VII, VIII, and IX graders. The writer presents the dialogue that is considered as the dialogues containing preferred and dispreferred responses which are produce and absent based on CA literature. In this case, the writer categorizes the dialogues into three parts: the categorization of the actions, the categorizations of the correct and problematic dialogues, and the analysis. Further, Tables 1 through 4 show the total frequencies of dialogues analyzed from the electronic books (invitation in table 1, offer in table 2, request in table 3, and apology in table 4).

4.1 The Categorization

In categorizing the dialogues, the writer has to categorize which dialogues in those three textbooks belong to each action sequences (invitation, requests, offers, apologies). Furthermore, the four action sequences dialogues are analyzed into a specific categorization based on literature review that the writer has discussed in chapter II

4.2 The Grouping of Correct and Problematic Dialogues

In the tables, the writer tries to group the data based on whether the dialogues follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred responses
and put them into correct and problematic groups. Here is the explanation of each group.

4.2.1 The Correct Dialogues:

a. Follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred responses as have been explained in the literature review.

b. The situation is clearly explained in the dialogue. The context is also not confusing since it represents a real life conversation appropriately.

4.2.2 The Problematic Dialogues

a. Do not show the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred responses as have been explained in the literature review.

b. The situation is not clear but it does not seem natural like in real-life conversation. For example, a situation in the train where someone is asking whether a seat next to a passenger is empty. This is then followed by a request to sit there, while actually in reality it supposed to be followed by an offer by the passenger to sit next to him/her.

c. The preference structure of the response is too complicated since the actual response whether it is preferred or dispreferred delayed. Although according to the literature this is still authentic (i.e. insertion sequences between first pair part and second pair part), this can makes the sequence longer. Unfortunately, textbooks mostly do not explain what happens in the dialogues so
the students have more difficulty in understanding the action sequence. Therefore, this is categorized as problematic.

d. The preference structure is incomplete. The dialogue is missing a response to an action, whether invitations, requests, offers, or apologies, and other actions like questions, or pre-sequences.

### 4.3 Analysis of the Actions

#### 4.3.1 Invitation

The table below explains about the number of correct dialogues which contain invitations that were analyzed from three Junior High School's textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Correct Dialogues</th>
<th>Problematic dialogues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VIII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade IX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correct dialogue

As we seen in the table above, there is no correct dialogue. However, there are only four problematic dialogues in invitation, therefore the writer will analyze all of them below.

The problematic dialogues

The number of problematic dialogues is 4, which is more than the number of correct dialogues. Therefore, the table in the following
explains which dialogues number that has similarities problems with the dialogues in appendices.

Table 4.2 INVITATIONS DIALOGUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>The Dialogues Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.</td>
<td>✓ - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and unnatural conversations.</td>
<td>- ✓ ✓ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Show unclear conversation</td>
<td>- - - ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.

(English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 48)

At break time, Erwin is reading a book in class, then suddenly Dewi comes and greets him.

1 Dewi : Hi, Erwin. What are you doing?
2 Erwin : Well, I'm reading an English book. We're having a test tomorrow, remember?
3 Dewi : Wow. Great!
4 Erwin : Not at all. I just don't have anything else to do.
5 Dewi : By the way, I'm going to have a birthday party at my house this Sunday. I'm thirteen now.
6 Erwin : Happy birthday Dewi. Well, you're a teenager now.
7 Dewi : Thank you.
8 → I'd like you to come.
9 Erwin : I'm terribly sorry, I can't.
10 I have to go to my grandmother's house this Sunday. She is ill.
The above dialogue, we can see that it seems like natural conversation and the situation of the conversation is clear that Erwin in the break time then suddenly his friend Dewi comes and gives greeting to him. In that dialogue, Dewi gives greeting to Erwin before starting the dialogue. Then Erwin Gives response to Dewi. Moreover, the problem from that dialogue is when dewi do invitation she doesn’t give pre-invitation. So the dialogue above is considered being problematic because it does not follow the characteristic of accurate invitation dialogue based on CA literature. Further, the dialogue is problematic because it is a sudden invitation which is done in the end of dialogue in line 16.

b. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and unnatural conversations.

(English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 54)

Diana, her friends Shinta and Toni are walking home from school. They are talking about a party at Diana's house tonight.

1 Diana : Shinta, I am going to have a party tonight.
2 → Would you like to come?
3 Shinta : I'd love to! By the way,
4 what are you celebrating?
5 Diana : I won the Science Olympics last week.
6 Shinta : Congratulations. Wow, you're very clever.
7 Diana : Not at all. You just have to study harder.
8 → Will you come to my party?
9 Toni : I'm sorry, I can't. My parents are going to go to the hospital. I may be late getting to your party,
17 is that all right?
18 Diana : Yes, it's all right as long
19 as you are allowed by your
20 parents.
21 Shinta : Hmm, speaking about parents,
22 I have to call my father to
23 ask his permission.

The invitation is done in second and seventh line without
pre-invitation. It is better if the invitation above especially in the
seventh line started by a pre-invitation to avoid dispreferred
response. Further, the dialogue above does not follow the
characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response because the
typical of the invitation in line 3 and 12 is directly without any
insertion especially for the line 12. Further, it seems unnatural
corversation. Diana should give insertion of invitation before she
gave invitation to other her friend. It will more seem natural
corversation and it will make the conversation above goes
smoothly.

(English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 132)

1 Ramzi : Nice day, isn't it?
2 Cika : Yes, it is. Nice weather
3 we're having.
4 Ramzi : Look! This is a fantastic
5 sight!
6 Cika : Yes, I agree. I think it's
7 spectacular!
8 Ramzi : The weatherman says it'll be
9 sunny today.
10 Cika :- Really? Let's go camping
11 - then.
12 Ramzi : I'm sorry, I'd love to but
13 I can't. I have to finish my
14 geography project.

The dialogue above is problematic, Because Cika gave
invitation to Ramzi without pre-invitation. Even it dialogue
seems natural conversation. Cika should give pre-invitation to Ramzi in order to know whether Ramzi has planning or he doesn’t have. Further, it dialogue doesn’t follow the characteristic of invitation based on CA literature.

c. Show unclear conversation

1  Receptionist : All right, Sir.
2       I’ll get the porter
3              to show you the
4                   room now. I hope
5     you and your family
6         enjoy staying with
7           us.
8  Guest : Thank you very
9          much

The above dialogue seems natural conversation. The problematic dialogue is that the dialogue show unclear situation.
4.3.2 Offer

Table 2 Presents about the number of correct dialogues, problematic dialogues, and the total number of dialogues which contain offers that were analyzed from three Junior High School's textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Correct Dialogues</th>
<th>Problematic Dialogues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade IX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we seen in the table above, there is only 1, which is less than number of problematic dialogues. There are 6 problematic dialogues in offer. Therefore, the writer explain the correct dialogue bellow.

*(English in Focus for Grade VIII p.78)*

1 Erna : Where do you go, Fandi?
2 Fandi : Oh, hi Erna. I am going to
3 the bookstore
4 Erna : I see. Is there any books
5 that you interest with?
6 Fandi : Yes. I am looking for the
7 last series of Harry Potter.
8 I can’t wait to have it.
9 Erna : Oh, Harry Potter. Actually I
10 have that one.
11 → My be you want to borrow it
12 → from me?
13 Fandi : Thanks a lot, Erna. But I’d
14 like to have it myself. So I
15 must buy it.
16 Erna : Oh, sure. All right, I get
The dialogue above is interesting. It seems real life conversation by starting with greeting from first pair part then the second pair part give response. The dialogue above seems go-ahead. Before giving offering, the first pair part gives pre-offering as the sign of characteristic preferred and dispreferred response based on CA literature. Even there is rejection from second pair part, but still the type of rejection is not directly and it is not to the point.

**The problematic dialogues**

There are six dialogues which are problematic. Therefore, the table in the following explains which dialogues number that has similarities problems with the dialogues in appendices.

**Table 4.4 OFFERS DIALOGUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>The Dialogues Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and unnatural conversations.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Show unclear situation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.

*(English in Focus for Grade VII, page 9)*
Reni meets her cousin, Romi, on his way to the bookstore. Romi lives with Reni's family.
1 Reni : Hi, Romi!
2 Romi : Hi, Reni! What are you doing here?
3 Reni : I'm going to the bookstore. →Do you want to come with me?
4 Romi : No, I'm going home.
5 Rem : OK. See you at home.
6 Romi : See you.

The dialogue above doesn’t follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response based on CA literature. The offering is happen in line 5 and it comes suddenly without pre-offering.

(English in focus for Grade VII p. 62)
1 Waitress : Good afternoon.
2 →Can I help you?
3 Riki : Good afternoon. Yes, I'd like fried chicken with fries and a coke, please.
4 Waitress : →Would you like a regular or large coke?
5 Riki : Regular, please.
6 Waitress : →Would you like anything else?
7 Riki : Yes, I'd like an ice cream, please.
8 Waitress : What flavor would you like?
9 Riki : Chocolate, please.
10 Waitress : OK.

The dialogue above seems natural conversation. It’s started with greeting and it’s followed response. Further, it is being considered as problematic dialogue, when the offering comes without pre-offering.

b. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and unnatural conversations.
Andi is visiting his classmate Nila. At this time, Nila is in the backyard of her house.

1 Andi : Hi, Nila.
2 Nila : Hi, Andi.
3 Andi : What are you doing?
4 Nila : Well. I'm planting a rose now. Can you help me get the flower pot over there, please?
5 Andi : Yes, of course.

Andi takes the flower pot and gives it to Nila.

6 Andi : Here you are.
7 Nila : Thank you, Andi.
8 Andi : You're welcome. These flowers are beautiful.
9 Nila : Yes. My mother bought them for me.
10 Andi : Oh, I see. By the way, would you like me to water the flowers?
11 Nila : No, thanks. You don't have to.

The dialogue above seems like natural conversation. The greeting was done and the response was also happened. It seems go-ahead. Further, it is being considered as problematic, because the offer in line 17 comes suddenly without pre-offering. When andi gave offering to Nila, he should say “you are busy now. And the flowers need watering” as pre-offering rather then he say directly “would you like me to water the flowers. It caused the rejection come directly and rudely. If the pre-offering comes before, it can avoid the rejection directly.
c. Show unclear situation

(English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 35)

1  Budi :  Which is the most
2    exciting game for you
3    here?
4  Dani :  Well, I must say that
5    roller coaster is the
6    most exciting game.
7  Budi :  Yes, I agree. The roller
8    coaster gave me an
9    unforgettable experience.
10   I think I want to ride it
11    again.
12  Dani :  Yes, me too. By the way,
13    are you chewing gum? Can
14    I have some?
15  Budi :  Yes, of course. Here you
16    are.
17  Dani :  Thanks.
18  Budi :  Do you want the new
19    banana flavour? It tastes
20    good.
21  Dani :  Not for me, thanks. I
    don't like bananas.

We can see from the dialogue above that it shows unclear situation. The first, it talks about game then suddenly it talks about gum. Actually the above dialogue is not also follow the characteristic CA literature. When Budi gave offering to Dani, he didn’t give pre-offering. He just said “do you want the new banana flavor?” whether he didn’t feel that Dani like or dislike. Further, it makes confusing to the readers. when they read, the topic is about game, but then they read the topic is about gum.

(English in Focus for Grade IX)

1  Riana :  Hi, Angga. Care to taste
2    this
3  Angga :  What is it? It looks so
delicious.
4  Riana :  Well, I call this fruit
5    kebab.
7 Angga : Oh I see. How do you make them?
8 Riana : It’s easy. I saw the recipe in my mom’s magazine.
12 Angga : Great! Of course I’ll taste it

The dialogue above seems unnatural conversation, because the pre-offer is not happen and the offer comes directly.

(English in Focus for Grade IX p…….)

1 Vita : I brought some sandwiches.
2 Nely : Do you want some
3 Nely : Thank you. It’s very delicious. Fantastic taste
5 Vita : I made them by myself.

4.3.3 Request

Table 3 explains about the number of correct dialogues, problematic dialogues, and the total number of dialogues which contain requests that were analyzed from three Senior High School’s textbooks.

Table 4.5 REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Correct Dialogues</th>
<th>Problematic dialogues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade IX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correct dialogue

According to the table above, there are five dialogues which are correct. Therefore, the writer explain some dialogues which are correct based on the CA literature that the writer was discussed in the literature review below.

a. Follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response based on CA literature.

(12 English in Focus for Grade VII page 42)

1 Adrian : Good drivers don't speed the way you do.
2 Airien : Do not talk too much, do not worry, we are OK.
3 Adrian : Yes, but I am warning you, someday a cop is going to stop you.
4 Airien : OK, take it easy.

Suddenly there's a sirine sound

12 Adrian : Oopss, do you hear that?
14 Airien : Well ... uh-hu....
15 What do you think of that sound?
17 Adrian : What do I think? Come on Airien ... that's a police sirine, even 9 a child knows!

Then, a police officer with his motorcycle gives a sign to Airien and Adrian to stop.

22 Airien : Oh, my God. Now, he is going to put me in a jail.
25 Police officer :→Good afternoon, Miss. I believe that you're driving too fast. May I see
Airien: Yes, certainly, Sir. All right, here you are.

After a while

Police officer: Since you bring your driving license and you're a student, I will just give you a warn to drive more careful. But, I have your name, address, and your car's number. So, I'll be watching you, OK? Be careful next time. Drive with more responsible.

Airien: Yes, yes, I will remember, Sir. Thank you very much.

The dialogue above seems natural conversation. The request comes before pre-request and it's done in line 26-27. Before giving the request, the policeman did greeting and pre-request in line 25 and it condition is also found in the number of dialogue 14 in the appendices.

(16 English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 9)

Rudy: Hi, Dedy. How are you today?
Dedy: Hi, Rudy. Fine, and a bit excited.
Rudy: Are you? Excited about what?
Dedy: Well, my pet cat has had kittens. They're cute, small, and very adorable.
→ Oh you should have seen
11 → them.
12 Rudy : Sure, I'd love to!

The situation of above dialogue is clear and simple. And the dialogue is started greeting and it’s followed by response. Before doing request, Dedy did pre-request. He didn’t directly say request to Rudy. So the request got preferred response. Further, it seems natural conversation. This situation can also be found in the number of dialogue 24 in the appendices.

(24 English in focus for Grade IX p)

1 Loki : Hi, Tari. What are you doing?
2 Tari : Hi, Loki. I’m reading the story Si Pungguk from West Sumatra
3 Loki : Well, what’s so special?
4 Tari : Tell me more
5 Loki : This story is about powerful love.
6 Tari : What an interesting story! Well, unfortunately, it ended sadly.

(25 English in focus for Grade IX p…)

1 Neneng : Excuse me, ma’am.
2 Ms Ira : Yes, Neneng. What’s the matter?
3 Neneng : May I borrow your dictionary? I need to look up a new vocabulary
4 Ms Ira : Sure, here you are.
5 Neneng : Thank you Ms Ira. I’ll return as soon as possible.

The problematic dialogues

These are some examples of the problematic dialogues and the explanation why they are problematic. However, the table in the following
page explains which dialogues number that has similarities problems with
the dialogues in appendices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>The Dialogues Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unnatural conversation.</td>
<td>- - - - - - √ - - - - √ - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.</td>
<td>- √ - √ - - - √ - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and Unnatural conversation.</td>
<td>- - - - - √ - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The preference structure is complicated and the situation is not clear.</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response.

(13 English in Focus for Grade VII p. 89)

1 Baim : Where are you going, Febi?
2 Febi  : Oh, I’am going to the canteen.
3 Baim  : → Can I join?
4 Febi  : Sure. Let’s go.
5 Baim  : Any way, what’s your favorite food?
6 Febi  : I love fried noodle so much, but I can’t stand fried prawn, I’am allergy. What about you, Baim?
7 Baim  : I see. Well, I enjoy vegetables soup and I hate nuts.
The above dialogue seems like natural conversation. Starting conversation is greeting, then it’s followed by response from second pair-part. The situation seems like go-ahead. The problematic of the above dialogue is that the pre-request is not happened before. Further, the similar problem of this dialogue could also be found in dialogue number 15, 20 and 22 in appendices.

(17 English in focus for Grade VIII p. 11)

1 Nina :→Niko, can you do me a
2     →favour, please?
3 Niko :→Of course, what can I do
4     →for you?
5 Nina : Would you be so kind as
6     to take care of my cat.
7 I'm going to Bogor
8 tomorrow to visit my
9 uncle, he is sick. I'll be
10 there for about two days.
11 Niko : I'd be very happy to take
12     care of your cat. I love
13     cats.
14 Nina : Great. Thanks.
15 Niko : Should I bathe it?
16 Nina : No, it's not necessary.

The dialogue above is not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response based on CA literature and it doesn’t seem natural conversation. further, The dialogue above is problematic because the request comes suddenly without pre-request. The similarity of this problem is also can be found in the dialogue number 21 in appendices.

(18 English in focus for Grade VIII p. 15)

Restu and Roni are in a zoo, looking at some birds in the cages.
Roni : What's so special about birds? Tell me about them.
Restu : Of course, most birds can fly.
Roni : Do you know birds that can't fly?
Restu : Hmm, ostriches, emus, and the bird from Papua what's its name?
Roni : Oh, cassowary, right?
Restu : Yeah, that's right. Why are you asking? Do you like birds too?
Roni : Sure, birds are beautiful. I like peacocks very much.
Restu : Peacocks? With their fanlike tails, right? I like them too.

The dialogue above seems follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response. The request comes after the pre-request. In the dialogue above, Roni is doing request to the Restu with pre-request “what so special about birds”. Then he makes request. Moreover, it is being considered is not problematic. Why it is problematic? The problematic of above dialogue is that it is not seem natural conversation. Before starting conversation, Roni should say greeting or he should say some kind of opening of conversation. Further, the problematic of this dialogue is also can be found in the dialogue number 23 in appendices.

(19 English in focus for Grade VIII p.35)

Budi : Which is the most exciting game for you here?
Dani : Well, I must say that Roller coaster is the most Exciting game.
Budi : Yes, I agree. The roller coaster gave me an unforgettable experience.
9 I think I want to ride it again.
10 Dani : Yes, me too. By the way,
11 → Are you chewing gum? Can I
12 → Have some?
13 Budi : Yes, of course. Here you
14 are.
15 Dani : Thanks.
16 Budi : Do you want the new banana
17 flavour? It tastes good.
18 Dani : Not for me, thanks. I don't
19 like bananas.

The dialogue above shows unclear situation. The first situation
talks about game then suddenly it changes to the second situation
about gum. Even in the dialogue above follows the characteristic of
preferred and dispreferred response, it is being considered as the
dialogues which is problematic. Further, the problematic dialogues
comes when the situation is not clear whether it talks about the game
or it talks about the gum. It can make the readers confusing when
they read certain topic then suddenly the topic changed.

4.3.4 Apology

Table 4 explains about the number of correct dialogues,
problematic dialogues, and the total number of dialogues which
contain apologies as the main action that were analyzed from three
Junior High School's textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Correct dialogues</th>
<th>Problematic Dialogues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade VIII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English in Focus for Grade IX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correct dialogues

The apology was found in two dialogues below. The writer only found two dialogues from three English Electronic Books Junior High School which are categorized as apology, and they are in correct dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>The Dialogues Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Do not show a correct preference structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(English in Focus for Grade VII p. 68)

1 Mr Imron: How much is a kilogram of apples?
2 Seller : Which kind, Sir?
3 Mr Imron: These red ones.
4 Seller : It's Rp15,000.
5 Mr Imron: Oh, ... it's too expensive.
6 Seller : No, Sir. These are very good apples.
7 Mr Imron: I see. But can I have them for Rp12,000?
8 Seller : Sorry, Sir. The price is fixed.
9 Mr Imron: Well ... OK then, give me two kilograms, please.

The dialogue above seems natural conversation. It is also follow the characteristic of preferred dispreferred response
based on CA literature. The apology comes before dispreferred as the reason that the dialogue is correct dialogue.

1 Erna : Joni, where have you been? I’ve been waiting for you an hour now.
2 Joni : I’am sorry, I forgot that we’re supposed to meet at one o’clock.
4 Joni : I’am very sorry Erna. I won’t do that again.
5 Please forgive me.
6 Erna : Ah that’s Ok. But don’t make me wait for your again.
7 Joni : Thank you. I won’t do that. I promise.

According to CA literature, the dialogue above follows the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response. the apology comes before dispreferred. When Joni was angered by Erna, he didn’t directly reject the Erna’s statement. Further, the dialogue above seems natural conversation. The situation is clear on the angry situation. Even it dialogue was not started by greeting, it is still categorized as correct dialogue. Why is it so, because the dialogue above is on the angrier situation.

*The problematic dialogues*

As we seen in the table above, two dialogues which are categorized as apology are on correct dialogue.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

English textbooks may become one of the main sources for Indonesian people in teaching-learning process since they are considered having a great influence for the students in evaluating evaluation and analyzing certain ideas. Therefore, English textbooks play a significant role to help the students in reaching the goal of communicative competence. In order to meet these needs, Indonesian Government has begun to provide textbooks in the form of soft copy which is known as electronic book. It can be downloaded freely and easily by all of the people especially teachers and students in Indonesia. These electronic books are the focus of the study. Here, the writer analyzes three English electronic books used by Junior High School taken from www.bse.depdiknas.go.id.

As the main source, English textbooks should provide the authentic materials or at least based on the rate scales on natural language. However, the writer found that there were some inaccuracies in those three textbooks, especially in the dialogues. There were still many inaccuracies found in the dialogue according to the real life conversation. Based on Conversation Analysis (CA) parameter, there were some inaccuracies found in the four sequences investigated in this thesis: invitation, offer, request and apology.

From the analysis of Three Electronic English books of Junior High School, the writer found 4 dialogues which are included the invitation and none of them are correct dialogue. In this case, there were Three inaccuracies that occurred in the 4 problematic dialogues: a) Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and
dispreferred response. b) Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response, and do not show natural conversation. c) Show unclear situation.

Meanwhile, there were 3 problems found in offer dialogue: a) do not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response, b) do not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response, and unnatural conversation c) show unclear situation

Moreover, from the request dialogues, the writer found 9 problematic dialogues. In this case, there were four inaccuracies that occurred in the 9 problematic dialogues: a) Unnatural conversation, b) Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response, c) Do not follow the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response and Unnatural conversation. d) The preference structure is complicated and the situation is not clear. Further, the pre-request was produce only in some of request dialogue. Thus, pre-request is important to be thought to avoid the rejection of the request.

In the apology dialogue, the writer only found 2 dialogues among three English electronic books because it is rarely to find the apology as the main action in those three text books.

The writer concludes that most of the problems are because the dialogues do not show natural conversation and because those dialogues do not follow the characteristic of preferred and dispreferred response. further, some parts of the dialogues (including the preference structure and the way action done) are left. In addition, the dialogues do not show a good order according to the structure of talk in natural conversation.
On the other hand, the writer also found that the varieties of dialogues in those text books are not so many. For example, pre-sequence is rarely found; the response of the four action rarely absent; the appreciation and the apology as the way of the dispreferred response to mitigated and elaborated are done This support the fact that text books dialogues indeed inaccurate. Thus, the three text books investigated should be revised in order to increase the education quality in Indonesia.
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INVITATION

(1. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 48)

At break time, Erwin is reading a book in class, then suddenly Dewi comes and greets him.

Dewi : Hi, Erwin. What are you doing?
Erwin : Well, I'm reading an English book. We're having a test tomorrow, remember?
Dewi : Wow. Great!
Erwin : Not at all. I just don't have anything else to do.
Dewi : By the way, I'm going to have a birthday party at my house this Sunday. I'm thirteen now.
Erwin : Happy birthday Dewi. Well, you're a teenager now.
Dewi : Thank you. I'd like you to come.
Erwin : I'm terribly sorry, I can’t. I have to go to my grandmother's house this Sunday. She is ill.

(2English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 54)

Diana, her friends Shinta and Toni are walking home from school. They are talking about a party at Diana's house tonight.

Diana : Shinta, I am going to have a party tonight. Would you like to come?
Shinta : I'd love to! By the way, what are you celebrating?
Diana : I won the Science Olympics last week.
Shinta : Congratulations. Wow, you're very clever.
Diana : Not at all. You just have to study harder. Will you come to my party?
Toni : I'm sorry, I can't. My parents are going to go to the hospital. I may be late getting to your party, is that all right?
Diana : Yes, it's all right as long as you are allowed by your parents.
Shinta : Hmm, speaking about parents, I have to call my father to ask his permission.

(3English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 132)

Ramzi : Nice day, isn't it?
Cika : Yes, it is. Nice weather we're having.
Ramzi : Look! This is a fantastic sight!
Cika : Yes, I agree. I think it's spectacular!
Ramzi : The weatherman says it'll be sunny today.
Cika : Really? Let's go camping then.
Ramzi : I'm sorry, I'd love to but I can't. I have to finish my geography project.
(4..)
Receptionist : All right, Sir. I’ll get the porter to show you the room now. I hope you and your family enjoy staying with us.
Guest : Thank you very much

Offer:

(5. English in Focus for Grade VII, page 9)
René meets her cousin, Romi, on his way to the bookstore. Romi lives with René's family.
René : Hi, Romi!
Romi : Hi, René! What are you doing here?
René : I'm going to the bookstore. Do you want to come with me?
Romi : No, I'm going home.
Rem : OK. See you at home.
Romi : See you.

(6. English in focus for Grade VII p. 62)
Waitress: Good afternoon. Can I help you?
Riki : Good afternoon. Yes, I'd like fried chicken with fries and a coke, please.
Waitress: Would you like a regular or large coke?
Riki : Regular, please.
Waitress: Would you like anything else?
Riki : Yes, I'd like an ice cream, please.
Waitress: What flavor would you like?
Riki : Chocolate, please.
Waitress: OK.

(7. English in Focus for Grade VIII p.3)
Andi is visiting his classmate Nila. At this time, Nila is in the backyard of her house.
Andi : Hi, Nila.
Nila : Hi, Andi.
Andi : What are you doing?
Nila : Well. I'm planting a rose now. Can you help me get the flower pot over there, please?
Andi : Yes, of course.
Andi takes the flower pot and gives it to Nila.
Andi : Here you are.
Nila : Thank you, Andi.
Andi : You're welcome. These flowers are beautiful. Are they all yours?
Nila : Yes. My mother bought them for me.
Andi : Oh, I see. By the way, would you like me to water the flowers?
Nila : No, thanks. You don't have to.

Budi : Which is the most exciting game for you here?

Dani : Well, I must say that roller coaster is the most exciting game.

Budi : Yes, I agree. The roller coaster gave me an unforgettable experience. I think I want to ride it again.

Dani : Yes, me too. By the way, are you chewing gum? Can I have some?

Budi : Yes, of course. Here you are.

Dani : Thanks.

Budi : Do you want the new banana flavor? It tastes good.

Dani : Not for me, thanks. I don't like bananas.

Erna : Where do you go, Fandi?

Fandi : Oh, hi Erna. I am going to the bookstore.

Erna : I see. Is there any books that you interest with?

Fandi : Yes. I am looking for the last series of Harry Potter. I can't wait to have it.

Erna : Oh, Harry Potter. Actually I have that one. My be you want to borrow it from me?

Fandi : Thanks a lot, Erna. But I'd like to have it myself. So I must buy it.

Erna : Oh, sure. All right, I get to go. Bye.

Fandi : Bye, Erna.

Riana : Hi, Angga. Care to taste this?

Angga : What is it? It looks so delicious.

Riana : Well, I call this fruit kebab.

Angga : Oh I see. How do you make them?

Riana : It's easy. I saw the recipe in my mom's magazine.

Angga : Great! Of course I’ll taste it.

Vita : I brought some sandwiches. Do you want some

Nely : Thank you. It’s very delicious. Fantastic taste

Vita : I made them by myself.

Request:

Adrian : Good drivers don't speed the way you do.

Airien : Do not talk too much, do not worry, we are OK.

Adrian : Yes, but I am warning you, someday a cop is going to stop you.

Airien : OK, take it easy.

Suddenly there's a serine sound.
Adrian : Oopss, do you hear that?
Airien : Well ... uh-hu... What do you think of that sound?
Adrian : What do I think? Come on Airien ... that's a police sirine, even a child knows!
Then, a police officer with his motorcycle gives a sign to Airien and Adrian to stop.
Airien : Oh, my God. Now, he is going to put me in a jail.
Police officer : Good afternoon, Miss. I believe that you're driving too fast. May I see your driving license, please?
Airien : Oh, yeah... I mean yes, certainly, Sir. All right, here you are.
After a while
Police officer : Since you bring your driving license and you're a student, I will just give you a warn to drive more careful. But, I have your name, address, and your car's number. So, I'll be watching you, OK? Be careful next time. Drive with more responsible.
Airien : Yes, yes, I will remember, Sir. Thank you very much.

(13. English in Focus for Grade VII p. 89)

Baim : Where are you going, Febi?
Febi : Oh, I'am going to the canteen.
Baim : Can I join?
Febi : Sure. Let's go.
Baim : Any way, what's your favorite food?
Febi : I love fried noodle so much, but I can't stand fried prawn, I'am allergy. What about you, Baim?
Baim : I see. Well, I enjoy vegetables soup and I hate nuts.

(14. English in Focus for Grade VII p. 106)

Uncle Ferdi : Hello, Risa. Where have you been?
Risa : Oh, hello Uncle Ferdi. I'm very busy with my school' project.
Uncle Ferdi : Oh, I see. Err, Risa, by the way, Can you give me that newspaper? I haven't read it yet.
Risa : Sure, uncle. Here you are.
Uncle Ferdi : How's your school anyway?
Risa : Doing good Uncle. I must face final exam next week. By the way, would you please pass me the syrup, Uncle?
Uncle Ferdi : Yes, of course. Ok, just study hard for your final exam.
Risa : Yes, Uncle. Thank you very much.

(15. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 3)

Andi is visiting his classmate Nila. At this time, Nila is in the backyard of her house.
Andi : Hi, Nila.
Nila : Hi, Andi.
Andi : What are you doing?
Nila : Well. I'm planting a rose now. Can you help me get the flower pot over there, please?
Andi : Yes, of course.
Andi takes the flower pot and gives it to Nila.
Andi : Here you are.
Nila : Thank you, Andi.
Andi : You're welcome. These flowers are beautiful. Are they all yours?
Nila : Yes. My mother bought them for me.
Andi : Oh, I see. By the way, would you like me to water the flowers?
Nila : No, thanks. You don't have to.

(16. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 9)

Rudy : Hi, Dedy. How are you today?
Dedy : Hi, Rudy. Fine, and a bit excited.
Rudy : Are you? Excited about what?
Dedy : Well, my pet cat has had kittens. They're cute, small, and very adorable. Oh you should have seen them.
Rudy : Sure, I'd love to!

(17. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 11)

Nina : Niko, can you do me a favor, please?
Niko : Of course, what can I do for you?
Nina : Would you be so kind as to take care of my cat. I'm going to Bogor tomorrow to visit my uncle, he is sick. I'll be there for about two days.
Niko : I'd be very happy to take care of your cat. I love cats.
Nina : Great. Thanks.
Niko : Should I bathe it?
Nina : No, it's not necessary.

(18. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 15)

Restu and Roni are in a zoo, looking at some birds in the cages.
Roni : What's so special about birds? Tell me about them.
Restu : Of course, most birds can fly.
Roni : Do you know birds that can't fly?
Restu : Hmm, ostriches, emus, and the bird from Papua what's its name?
Roni : Oh, cassowary, right?
Restu : Yeah, that's right. Why are you asking? Do you like birds too?
Roni : Sure, birds are beautiful. I like peacocks very much.
Restu : Peacocks? With their fanlike tails, right? I like them too.

(19. English in Focus for Grade VIII p. 35)

Budi : Which is the most exciting game for you here?
Dani : Well, I must say that roller coaster is the most exciting game.
Budi : Yes, I agree. The roller coaster gave me an unforgettable experience. I think I want to ride it again.
Dani : Yes, me too. By the way, are you chewing gum? Can I have some?
Budi : Yes, of course. Here you are.
Dani : Thanks.
Budi : Do you want the new banana flavor? It tastes good.
Dani : Not for me, thanks. I don't like bananas.

(20. English in focus for Grade VIII p.54)
Shinta is using her cell phone to call her father at her house.
Shinta : Hello, good afternoon, Dad!
Mr Kusye : Afternoon, Shinta.
Shinta : Dad, can I go to Diana's party tonight, please? Tomorrow is a holiday. I don't have any homework.
Mr Kusye : Yes, certainly, but what time will the party be over?
Shinta : I think about 11 p.m., Dad.
Mr Kusye : Well, I'm afraid I can't let you stay until 11, Shinta. We are going to go to your grandparents the next morning. How about if I pick you up at 10, so you'll have time to rest before you go for the trip.
Shinta : All right, Dad. Thanks. See you later.

(21. English in focus for Grade VIII p. 86)
Nadine, Fitri, and Dara are friends. They are preparing Andre's party.
Nadine : Fitri, please go to the shop and buy a kilo of sugar. We have to bake a cake for Andre's party.
Fitri : Please wait, Let me shut down my computer first.
Nadine : Dara, Can you take thirty plates from the cupboard?
Dara : Sure, Do you want the pink plates, the blue plates, or the purple plates?
Nadine : Take the pink and the purple plates.
Dara : Do you want some forks and spoons?
Nadine : Yes, Please.
Dara : You're busy baking the cake, Nadine. Can I help you?
Nadine : No, thanks. It's almost done.

(22. English in focus for Grade VIII p. 109)
Ane : Polo, can you help me, please?
Polo : Sure! What's wrong, Ane? You look sick.
Ane : I've got a headache, and my body feels cold.
Polo : What? Here, I have a thermometer. Let me check your temperature. You have a fever, your temperature is quite high. I suggest you to see a doctor.

(23. English in focus for Grade VIII p. 130)
Mr Kingsley : Excuse me, do you know where the first National Bank is, Madam?
Miss Hana : Yes. Just go straight down this road and the bank is on your right, Sir!
Mr Kingsley : Thank you very much, Madam. By the way, can you tell me how to get to the subway station from the bank?
Miss Hana : Sure, you have to take the no. 12 bus and get off in Burbank street. The subway station is there.
Mr Kingsley : Are you sure? As far as I know the guide book informs us that we have to take the no. 14 bus.
Miss Hana : You're right. I confused the no. 14 bus with the no. 12 one.
Mr Kingsley : Thank you, Madam. Have a pleasant day.
Miss Hana : You're very welcome, Sir.

(24. English in focus for Grade IX p.)

Loki : Hi, Tari. What are you doing?
Tari : Hi, Loki. I am reading the story Si Pungguk from West Sumatra
Loki : Well, what’s so special? Tell me more
Tari : This story is about powerful love.
Loki : What an interesting story! Well, unfortunately, it ended sadly.

(25. English in focus for Grade IX p.)

Neneng : Excuse me, ma’am.
Ms Ira : Yes, Neneng. What’s the matter?
Neneng : May I borrow your dictionary? I need to look up a new vocabulary
Ms Ira : Sure, here you are.
Neneng : Thank you Ms Ira. I’ll return as soon as possible.

Apology:

(26. English in Focus for Grade VII p. 68)
Mr Imron : How much is a kilogram of apples?
Seller : Which kind, Sir?
Mr Imron : These red ones.
Seller : It's Rp15,000.
Mr Imron : Oh, ... it's too expensive.
Seller : No, Sir. These are very good apples.
Mr Imron : I see. But can I have them for Rp12,000?
Seller : Sorry, Sir. The price is fixed.
Mr Imron : Well ... OK then, give me two kilograms, please.

(27 English in Focus for Grade VII p)
Erna : Joni, where have you been? I’ve been waiting for you an hour now.
Joni : I’m sorry, I forgot that we’re supposed to meet at one o’clock
Erna : What? How could you forget? I’ve reminded you
Joni : I’m very sorry Erna. I won’t do that again. Please forgive me.
Erna : Ah that’s Ok. But don’t make me wait for you again.
Joni : Thank you. I won’t do that. I promise.