

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Review of related theories

2.1.1. Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a field of study concerned with the norms, practices and competences underlying the organization of social interaction. CA is concerned with all forms of spoken interaction including not only everyday conversation between friends and acquaintances, but also interactions in medical, education, mass media and socio-legal context, relatively 'monologic' interactions such as web-based multiparty communication (Drew & Curl, 2008, p.22). For conversation analysts, conversation is the main way in which people come together, exchange information, negotiate and maintain social relations. CA focuses on generic interaction problems which find solutions in the local resources of particular languages and social systems. Schegloff stated that this approach actually encourages comparison, by looking across different languages or communities that can be seen in the way same interactional problem is solved through the mobilization of different resources (Sidnell, 2009). It argues that conversation has its own dynamic structure and rules, and looks at the method used by speaker to make structure conversation efficiency (Pridham, 2001). The aim of CA is to demonstrate how participants both produce and respond to evolving social context using conversational rather than contextual data (Paltridge, 2006, p. 107).

2.1.2. Characteristics of Mobile Phone

A research has been made by Bodomo from Hong Kong University during several years that focus on Computer Mediated Communication (CMC). He finally found several characteristic of mobile phone which has been an alternative device for communication nowadays. Most of his participants already use mobile phone for over 5 years and use it more than once in a day. It stated that most of the mobile phone users use the mobile phone after office hour and most of them use it while they were on the street. Even though mobile phone is a leading innovation in communication device but this research revealed that most of the respondent use mobile phone not more than 15 minutes for a call. In other words, mobile phone call is only used for important purposes only, such as making an appointment, informing locations, business affairs, personal chat, and emergencies situation. It happens because mobile has some different functions than just being used for long-distance call (Bodomo, 2010).

It is suspected that people prefer mobile phone to landline phone due to some eminence of mobile phone functions; moreover it is easier to reach people anytime and anywhere. Mobile phone displays the caller's number, so the recipient had already known the caller's identity. In addition, a call in mobile phone provides some features that can pause call without ending the phone call, those features are like call waiting, call hold, call forwarding, call barring and make a conference call for more than two person. A caller can also record her/his voice and send it to a recipient by sending a voice mail. Moreover, they can use mobile internet in their own phone to make them easier in sending or receiving

email. Sending a *short message service* can also be the eminence of mobile phone to landline phone and it has become a habit to young people especially students. Those are some eminence they could get from mobile phone which landline phone does not have (Bodomo, 2010). In short, the characteristics of mobile phone conversation:

- Easier to reach people via mobile phone
- Can be used anywhere and anytime
- Informing people about their location
- Making appointments
- Emergencies

2.1.3. Casual Conversation

Casual conversation is an interaction between two people without any certain topic and usually it is only for their requirement which done within friend. It can be said that casual conversation occurs in social and public area or happen when formality situation is not required. Carter stated that in casual conversation, speakers may talk about something which is more personal (Carter, 2004). In addition, the topics itself can change in several times. Heritage said that in ordinary conversation or casual conversation, topics may appear in free and various ways (Heritage, 1998). Furthermore, the participants can give various contributions to the topic discussed or they can offer a new discussion topic. In other words different culture may influence someone in communication strategies. As Schegloff (1987) stated that, this is caused by different setting, context and

participant will affect people interact each other whether it is formal or informally situation.

2.1.4. Closing Sections in Telephone Conversation

Conversation does not simply begin and end. However it must take some signals to show that conversation has already ended. Therefore, communication cannot happen without these signals. Without them conversation cannot be ended. The ending of conversation is important because one party does not just stop speaking when the topic has ended. In other words, the closing section can only occur when a topic has ended and other parties have agreed not to introduce any new topic. Both parties may get confused if they do not know why the conversation stopped, because one of the parties cannot leave the conversation without any signals mentioned.

As Button (1987) stated that closing might be preceded by a number of pre-sequences, such as the making of an arrangement, referring back to something previously said in the conversation, the initiation of a new topic (which may not be responded to), good wishes, and a restatement of the reason for calling and thanks for calling. Equally the closing may be extended into continued repetition of pre-closing and closing pairs (such as 'bye', 'bye', 'sleep well', 'you too', etc) (Button, 1987, cited in Paltridge, 2006, p. 112).

Closing sections, according Schegloff and Sack, proposed such components terminal exchange of "good-bye", "see you", "thank you", where there is no possibility to insert any topics. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) argued that

a conversation was not simply ended, but is brought to a close. Schegloff and Sacks's propose that before producing a terminal greeting such as *bye*, participant needs to agree that this is a suitable position for terminal greetings. One form of proper closing can be accomplished by:

- A: O.K.
 B: O.K.
 A: Bye Bye
 B: Bye

Schegloff and Sacks found the concept of a closing section, and divided the section into two categories such as “pre closing” section which has four signals, for instance; “warrant”, “topic bounding”, “making arrangement”, and “misplacement marking”, the second section is “final closing” section (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

In the Schegloff and Sacks American telephone closing, the pattern that Schegloff found in closing section usually begins with pre-closing section first, then followed with one or two of the signals, and at last continued by final closing.

2.1.4.1. Pre Closing Section

Schegloff and Sacks said that the first proper way of initiating a closing section is one kind of ‘pre – closing’. Pre – closing or is an indicator that one party is ready to terminate the conversation. The forms of pre-closings are like, “We-ell..”, “O.K...”, “So-oo”, etc (with downward intonation contours), these forms constitute the entire utterances (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973. p. 303). This is the

signal that is given to both participants to show that the end of a conversation is near. It means that, one of the party give clues a signal to initiate a closing section and the other parties agrees to close the conversation.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) considered the case in which the possible pre-closing's provision for further topic is exploited. The other possibility is that one party decline an opportunity to insert any topics, for example the form below:

A: O.K,

B: O.K

When the possible pre-closing is responded to in this way, it may constitute the first part of the closing section. In addition, that form operates as possible pre-closings when placed at the end of a topic (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 304).

In the pre-closing section there is four signals that can be inserted in the conversation, first is topic bounding signal, second is warrant signal, third is making arrangement, and the last in misplacement marking. The placed itself could be at the beginning of pre-closing or before the pre-closing occur in the conversation.

2.1.4.1.1. Topic Bounding Signal

The first signal to initiate closing section which Schegloff emphasized is topic bounding technique. Topic bounding technique involve one party's offering proverbial or aphoristic formulation of conventional wisdom which can be heard as the 'moral' or 'lesson' of the topic being thereby possibly closed. When this formulation is offered by one party and agreed by another, a topic may be seen to

have been brought to a close (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 306). Here is the example:

- (1) Dorrinne: Uh-you know, it's just like bringin the
blood up
Theresa: Yeah, well, Thing us always work out for
the / / best
Dorrinne: Oh certainly. Alright / / Tess
Theresa: Uh huh,
Theresa: okay
Dorrinne: G'bye
Theresa: Goodnight
- (2) Johnson: ...and uhh, uh we're gonna see if we can't uh
tie in our plans a little better.
Baldwin: Okay//fine.
Johnson: ALRIGHT?
Baldwin: RIGHT
Johnson: Okay boy,
Baldwin: Okay
Johnson: Bye//bye
Baldwin: G'night

From the two conversations above, we can see that Dorrine and Johnson tried to offer proverbial formulation to the other parties as a moral topic. After the other parties agreed with that formulation, so the conversation might been brought to a close.

2.1.4.3. Warrant Signal

The second signal of closing section is the position of warrant signal. Warrant signal occurred when none of the parties of a conversation tend to continue the conversation. One technique of warranting signal is suggestion which was followed by routine question at the beginning of conversations. Afterwards, followed by "o.k." or "we-ell" such as "*well, I'll let you get back to you books,*

“*why don’t you lie down and take a nap?*” (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 311). The other technique of warrant signal, namely “*I gotta go*”, can be indicated as a reason, for instance, “*I gotta go, my dinner is burning*”. As Schegloff and Sacks stated, the overt of this signal can be used to interrupt a topic. It can also be placed after a topic close (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 312).

2.1.4.4. Making Arrangement Signal

The third signal is making arrangement signal. This signal may include “*making arrangements*”, with varieties such as giving directions, arranging later meetings, invitations, and the like; reinvocation of certain sorts of materials talked of earlier in the conversation, in particular, reinvocations of earlier-made arrangements (e.g., “*see you Wednesday*”) and reinvocation of the reason for initiating the conversation (“*well, I just wanted to find out how Bob was*”) (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 317).

2.1.4.5 Misplacement Marking Signal

The last signal of pre-closing section is misplacement marking signal. It happened when the new materials are inserted to a closing, and usually begins with “*by the way*” statement. Misplacement markers, shows an orientation with their user to the proper sequential in a conversation and recognition that an utterance that is inserted may not fit, and that the recipient should not attempt to use this placement in understanding their occurrence (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 319).

In case of closings, Schegloff and Sacks found that utterances introduce new topics may be included in misplacement marked when those utterances do not occur between the parts of an adjacency pair and do not accomplish an activity which has a proper place elsewhere in the conversation. Here is the example:

1. C: okay, thank you.
2. R: okay dear,
3. C:→ OH BY THE WAY, I'd just like tuh say thet uh, I do like the new programming. I've been listening, it's uh//
4. R: Good girl!
5. R: hey listen do me a favor wouldja write Mister Fairchild 'n tell im that, I think that'll s-shi-break up his whole day for im,
6. C: ehhh heh heh hhh!
7. R: okay?
8. C: okay,
9. R: thank you,
10. C: bye bye
11. R: mm buh(h) bye.

From the conversation above can be seen that in line 3 “OH BY THE WAY,” indicate as misplacement marking signal, because the caller inserted new topic in the middle of the conversation even the previous topics did not finish. The insertion of misplacement marked new materials into closing section, it may be added, marks the new topics themselves in a distinctive way. (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, p. 322).

2.1.4.6 Final Closing Section

Final closing is the actual “goodbyes” or some equivalent appropriate to the specific context of the conversation, such as “thank you”. Furthermore, Schegloff and Sacks stated that thanking before closing in telephone call can also be seen as a signature (1973, p.318). It means that thanking can be utilized as final

closing in phone conversation. Very frequently, people use the same expression, such as “bye” and “good night” using exactly the same form. In other words, people exchange the same expression such as “bye” and “bye”, and “good night” and “good night” in final closing (Takami, 2002, p. 78).

2.2. Review of Related Studies of Mobile Phones Conversation

There are several studies that have used conversation analysis to analyze certain conversation. One of the studies was conducted by Tomoko Takami's *A Study on Closing Section of Japanese Telephone (2002)*. In her study she investigates how Japanese telephone closings were realized between intimates with regard to pre-closing, terminal exchange, and leave taking. Takami indicates that the three features of Japanese telephone closing (pre-closing, terminal exchange, and leave-taking) represented key phases in the closing process. She also stated that speaker seemed to cooperate not only to finish the conversation but also not to threaten each other's face.

However from the three phases above, Takami emphasizes that leave taking is as important as the other two phases, because it is a step in which interlocutors confirm that are both working to finish the conversation and to reassure their continuing relationship. Repeating goodbyes also indicates as a signal that the speakers confirm to each other that they do not have something new to talk about. Therefore, this study also confirms that it is not uncommon that “*hai* (yes)” becomes the last utterance of a terminal adjacency pair. The result of her study, she found two sets of closing section. First, the three feature of

Japanese telephone closing; leave taking, pre-closing, and terminal exchange, represent key phases in the closing process. Second, in all the phases, speakers seem to cooperate not only to finish the conversation but also not to threaten each other's face. In her study she also suggests that closing a telephone conversation is a delicate and complicated process, even to speakers in close relationships.

Another research was conducted by Serafin Coronel in *Opening and Closings in Telephone Conversations between Native Spanish Speakers (1998)*. Her study analyzed the opening and closing sequences of native Spanish-speakers in natural telephone conversations conducted in Spanish. By using Schegloff and Sacks categories, she divided closing sequence into four categories; pre-closing, new topic introduction, recapitulation, and final closing.

In her data she found that both participants can initiate any stage of the closing process and both participants also has equal right to ignore such closing attempts to introduce new topics of conversation. She also stated that in closing, there is only one element that absolutely has to be present at all times to constitute terminal exchange that is final closing. At the ends of her research, she concluded that Hispanic conversational norms do indeed fall within Schegloff's canonical schema of universality, while at the same time exhibiting unique sequential variations. The variation that she proposes may or may not be culture-specific.