

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Conversation Analysis

There are many ways in which a particular approach in the social interaction can be explained and introduced. CA is one of the approaches that are usually used as the study of talking and interaction in all kinds of conversation. It focuses on the procedure of the analysis of talking in interaction. This analysis observes the way of the participants categorize their interaction systematically in solving their problem of talking.

Understanding interaction in the particular setting can be enhanced by the findings of Conversation Analysis (CA). CA itself is the area of discourse examining the problems and phenomena that occur in conversation properties in a variety of settings and context, and the interaction in the natural setting. The task of CA is to explain the meaning and the method of talk in natural interaction. Further, whether speaking their native language or another, whether fluently or not, whether to another or other doing the same or not, there are certain issues all participants in talk-in-interaction will find themselves dealing with (Schegloff, 2002). Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) said that conversation analysis is an approach to analysis derived from sociology and known as ethnomethodology. They argue that conversation has its own dynamic structure and rules, and looks at the methods used by speakers to structure conversation efficiently. It means that,

the proper object of sociology study is the set of technique that the members of a society themselves use to interpret and act within their own social worlds to all forms of talking in interaction. Hence the use of the term ethnomethodology is the study of 'ethnic' (i.e. participants' own) methods of production and interpretation of social interaction (Levinson, 1983).

## 2.2 Adjacency Pairs

Actually, adjacency pair occurs when one speaker's utterance makes a particular kind of response likely. Adjacency pairs are often used in the conversation of question-answer (Pridham, 2001). According to Pridham, the adjacency pair question-answer helps structuring of the conversation. How much the question throws open the topic, however, can be dependent on the nature of the question. In the same way, it is difficult to avoid answering repeated questions and as the importance of the question increases, the length of the question decreases. In other words, short, sharp questions are forceful in provoking a response. For example:

(1) (Pridham, 2001, p. 27)

- 1 Did you enjoy the spaghetti Bolognese?
- 2 Do you love her?
- 3 I think the Labour candidate's the best, don't you?
- 4 Are you going to put up with that?
- 5 What plans have you for the next few years?

Examples of adjacency pairs are not only in question-answer, but also actions with alternative type responses like offer-accept/decline, greeting-greeting, and invitation-accept/decline (Schegloff, 2007).

Adjacency pair organization has relevance rules that combine first pair part and second pair part. Schegloff (2007) says that “what relates first and second pair part can be termed a relationship of “conditional relevance” (p.20). It means that it prefers focusing on the response to the first pair parts rather than the second pair parts that are immediately relevant and expectable. When the second pair parts do not directly appear after the first pair parts or the seconds fail to occur or fail to receive the seconds, and another first pair parts show up. The question emerges on will be the first pair parts still considered conditionally relevant. As Levinson says:

If such a second fails to occur, it is noticeably absent; if some other first part occurs in its place then that will be heard where possible as some preliminary to the doing of the second part, the relevance of which is not lifted until it is directly attended to or aborted by the announced failure to provide some preliminary action. What the notion of conditional relevance makes clear is that what binds the parts of adjacency pairs together is not a formation rule of the sort that a question must receive an answer if it is to count as well-formed discourse, but the setting up of specific expectation which have to be attended to (p. 306)

Further, Schegloff (2007) also says that “first” and “second” do not refer merely to the order in which these turns happen to occur. It refers to the design features of these turn types and sequential positions. For example, a silence after a question could be thought of not answering or not talking and that the relevant second pair part (the answer) is “consequentially absent” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 20).

As a part of conversational structure, adjacency pairs have strong in-built expectations. It means that the questions are answered, statements, knowledge, complaints are replied and greetings are exchanged. The rules are ignored and these patterns are broken, this immediately creates a response (Pridham, 2001).

The major rule in using adjacency pairs is “having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker must stop speaking, and the next speaker must produce at that point a second part to the same pair” (Levinson, 1983). But, if the next speaker could not answer the question at the point a second part and the pattern or the rule of the answered questions are broken and ignored. Hence it could be called as “Breaking Adjacency Pairs”. For example:

(2) (Pridham, 2001, p. 27)

- 1           A: Hello  
           →    B: Good Bye
- 2           A: Did you go out with John last night?  
           →    B: Why are you asking?  
               A: Why do you think?
- 3           A: What do you think of this?  
           →    B: Gosh is that the time? I must go!
- 4           A: Your tea;s on the table  
           →    B: (6)  
               A: Did you hear what I said?  
           →    B: (4)  
               A: Answer me, will you?

The dialogues in number 1 to 4 above show how the speakers at those dialogues appear to flout the normal expectation of adjacency pairs. Questions are answered, statements are replied, but the rules and the patterns are broken. The

responses of second pair parts are not acceptable with the questions or the statements which are ordered by the first pair parts.

### 2.3 Preferred and dispreferred responses

Before moving on the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred responses, it is vital to look at the difference between the two terms not as a psychological orientation. Instead it 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 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, this will not affect the fact that an acceptance is a preferred response and a refusal is a dispreferred response for invitations. This is also true in other actions like requests where acceptance is the preferred response, whereas refusal is the dispreferred one (Levinson, 1983; Heritage, 1984).

#### *Characteristics of preferred responses*

A preferred response is generally done in a simple way. 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. Moreover, this type of response is linguistically unmarked (Levinson, 1983). As in the above, it said that a preferred response usually done in a simply way, so the preferred response does not have a

complex pattern. It is not difficult to be produced and it is also done in an uncomplicated turn. Since we are dealing with an acceptance as a preferred response, only two characteristics of acceptance are being discussed: simple and no delay (Heritage, 1984). For example:

- (3) (Levinson, 1983, p. 307)
- 1 Child : Could you .hh could you put on the  
2 light for my .hh room  
3 Father : → yep

The characteristics of preferred responses according to CA, simple and no delay were drawn from data like the above example.

Further Schegloff (2007) adds that “preferred responses are likely to be short and the point, and not ordinarily treated as ‘accountable’ ” (p.66).

#### *Characteristics of dispreferred responses*

Dissimilar with preferred responses, characteristics of dispreferred response are more complex. Therefore there are several features presented to identify the accuracy of dispreferred response in junior high school first grade textbook. Schegloff (2007) categorizes some group of features which can be used to recognize the dispreferred response such as mitigation, elaboration, default and positioning. Similar features are also presented by Levinson (1983) which incorporate delays, prefaces, accounts and declination component as the signs of dispreferred response.

### *Mitigation and elaboration*

Dispreferred responses are mostly mitigated or attenuated. The dispreferred response are always obvious, it never expressed clearly compared to preferred response (Putri, 2007, p. 13). Moreover, dispreferred responses are elaborated. Not like the preferred one which is short and simple. They are two ways for the dispreferred responses to mitigated and elaborated:

1. Accounts : - formulated explanation for why the (dispreferred) act is being done (Levinson, 1983)
2. Prefaces : a. the use of markers or announcers like *Uh* or *Well*  
 b. Appreciation (*it is very sweet of you*)  
 c. Apologies (*I'm sorry*)  
 d. Disclaimer (*I don't know*) etc.

(Schegloff 2007; Levinson, 1983)

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

### *Delay*

As has been explained above, preferred responses are most likely done in a short and simple way. In fact, they can sometimes come early in the next turn and be placed “contiguously” (Sacks, 1987). On the other hand, dispreferred responses usually come with a delay. 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 pauses, discourses markers, (e.g., Uuh, Well), or hedges (e.g., 'I dunno'). 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 sequences. The insertion sequence is needed so that the second pair part speaker can give receive information that is necessary for giving a response to the first pair part speaker. Examples of insertion sequence are another question after a question as first pair part or a question after an invitation (Putri, 2007, p. 14).

In the excerpt below, we can see examples of mitigation and elaboration (account, appreciation), and inter-turn gap which are shown by the arrows. Line 4 and 6 are the examples of inter-turn gap, line 5 is appreciation, while line 8, 9, 10, and 12 show an account.

- (4) (Schegloff, 2007, p. 65)
- 1 Emma : [wanna c'm] do:wn 'v [a bah:ta] lunch w]ith me?=  
 2 Nan : [It's js] ( ) ]  
 3 Emma : =Ah gut s'm beer'n stu:ff,  
 4 → (0,3)  
 5 Nan :→ ↑Wul yer ril sweet hon: uh:m  
 6 → (.)  
 7 Emma : [or d'y]ou'av] sup'n [else ( ) ]



8 Nan           :→ [L e t-] I : ] hu. [n:No: I haf to: uh call  
 9                   Roul's mother, I told'er I:'d call'er this morning  
 10                  I [gotta letter]=  
 11 Emma                [<sup>◻</sup>(Uh huh.)<sup>◻</sup> ]=  
 12 Nan                 =from'er en .hhhhh A:nd uhm  
 13                    (1.0)

*Preemptive reformulation with preference reversal*

According to Putri, It is common for the speakers to recognize the signs of an upcoming dispreferred response and then try to reformulate the first pair part. So, the preference organization for the second pair part is reversed. Before the dispreferred response comes, the speakers reformulate the turn so the second pair parts of dispreferred response can be said in a preferred way (2007, p. 15). As 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. Excerpt (2) has an example of preemptive reformulation with preference reversal. In line 7, Emma reformulated her invitation because she saw the signs of dispreferred response (line 4, 5, 6) with the previous one. In line 3, Emma elaborated her invitation by explaining what she had that might attract Nan. However, since there were some silences in line 4 and 6, and an appreciation for the invitation which was prefaced by a turn-initial delay *well* in line 5, she repeat 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 said, this characteristic is a combination of agreement + disagreement. However, the agreement to the first pair part is shown as a delay (therefore, it may also be included in the “delay” characteristics) 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, pp. 15-16). The excerpt 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.

(5) (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...

## 2.4 Action sequences

In this section, the writer is going to summarize four action sequences that focus on: invitations, requests, offers, and apologies. The first three sequences can be difficult to differentiate from one another while the last action sequence is quite distinct from the other three. Invitations, for example, can be viewed as a sub-class of offers (Schegloff, 2007). Requests can also sometimes be disguised

as offers. In this section, action sequences like invitations, offers, requests, apologies, and also ambiguous actions are explained.

### *Invitation*

Invitations are actions that commonly be found in real-life conversations. 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).

First, before explaining more about invitation, let's start to discuss about pre-invitation as one form of pre-sequence before the main action: invitations. Schegloff (2007) says, "Preliminaries that project such specific imminent First Pair Parts (FPPs) are called type-specific pre-sequences" (pp. 28-29). Further, he says, "there are two functions of pre-invitations: to project the possibilities that a base FPP (invitation) will be produced and also it makes relevant next the production of second pair part (response to pre-invitation)" (p.29). Some examples of pre-invitation would be "are you doing anything?" or "what are you doing tonight?". For that reason, pre-invitations cannot be separated from the invitations, since they are as important as the invitations themselves.

Pre-invitations have three types of responses: go-ahead, hedging, and blocking responses (Schegloff, 2007). A go-ahead response supports the recipient of the response to go-ahead with the invitations. An example of this type would be "no" to Are you doing anything? A blocking response helps the recipient to know the possibility that the invitation will be rejected. An example of this type of response is "I'm going out" to "What are you going tonight?" The last type of

response is hedging, in which the recipient cannot really know whether the invitations will be declined or accepted. However, Schegloff (2007) says that “this response can make a full response contingent on what the invitation is going to be” (p.25). An example of this type of response is “why”, which can be combined with another type of response either go-ahead or blocking.

(6) SB,1 (continued) (Schegloff, 2007, p. 31)

1 Judy: Hi John.  
 2 John:→ Ha you doin-< say what `r you doing.  
 3 Judy:→ Well we're going out. Why.  
 4 John:→ Oh, 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] well do 7  
 7 that.  
 8 Judy: ["Talk,"you  
 9 mean get drunk,don't you?]

The first arrow in line 2, “what `r you doing ”, shows the pre-invitation, and the response is in line 3 which is a combination of a blocking response and a hedging are similar to 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.28).

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 response 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 response of pre-offers (Schegloff, 2007). Similar to pre-invitations, pre-offers also have three kind of response: go-ahead, blocking, and hedging response. Below is an example of pre-offer with go-ahead response.

(7) Bookstore, 2, 1:107 (Schegloff, 2007, p. 35)

1 Cathy: I'm gonna buy a 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.  
 8 (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 a go-ahead response. The offer itself was done in line 6 where it has an acceptance as a preferred response in line 7.

Here is another example of pe-offer with a blocking response.

(8) Goldberg, (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

In the above excerpt, Peter and Marcus have been talking about a 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 best sequence, the offer, can be done or not. However, the shift from pre-sequence base sequence is not always smooth (Schegloff, 2007). The excerpt below shows this problem.

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

1 Debby: `hhh Um:: u-guess what I've-(u-)wuz lookin' in the paper:  
 2 → -have you got you waterbed yet?  
 3 Nick: Uh huh, it's really nice <sup>u</sup>too, I set it up  
 4 Debby: Oh rea:ly Already?  
 5 Nick: Mm hmm  
 6 (0.5)  
 7 Debby: Are you kidding?  
 8 Nick: No, well I ordered it last (week)/(spring)  
 9 (0.5)  
 10 Debby: Oh-no but you h- you've got it already?  
 11 Nick: Yeah h! hh+ ((laughing))  
 12 Debby: =hhh [hh `hh] ((laughing))  
 13 Nick: [ I just] said that  
 14 Debby: O::hh: hu[h, I just couldn't be[lieve you c-  
 15 Nick: [Oh (<sup>u</sup>it's just) [It'll sink in `n two  
 16 day[s fr'm now(then )((laugh)]  
 17 Debby: [ ( ( laugh )) ] Oh no cuz I justgot- I  
 18 saw an ad in the paper for a real discount waterbed s' I w'z  
 19 gonna tell you 'bout it=  
 20 Nick: =No this is really, you (haven't seen) mine you'll  
 21 real like it.  
 22 Debby: Ya:h. It's on a frame and everythi[ng?  
 23 Nick: [Yeah  
 24 Debby: `hh Uh (is) a raised frame?  
 25 Nick: <sup>u</sup>mm hmm  
 26 Debby: How: ni:ce,

The above excerpt shows a pre-offer in line 2 which gets a blocking response in line 3. 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 18 and 19, 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 20 and 21.

### *Request*

A request is another type of action that has similarities with the previous two actions: invitations and offers. However, in terms of a 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 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). Below is an example of how a pre-request elicits an offer rather than a request.

(10) SBL, (Schegloff, 2007, p. 91)

1 Beth : And uhm I have her book  
 2 (1.0)  
 3 Beth : Have you read it?  
 4 Abby : I think I have seen her book, I don't know whether  
 I've read  
 5 it all or not.  
 6 Beth : I Believe in Miracles  
 7 Abby : Yes,  
 8 Beth : And uh [I (have) -  
 9 Abby :→ [You have it you say?  
 10 Beth : Uh I Believe in Miracles  
 11 Abby :→I say do you have it?  
 12 Beth : Yes.

13 Abby : Uh huh,  
 14 Beth : And I'll be glad to (.let you have it(a week'rtwo).  
 15 Abby : Yes I'd like to cits an offer rather than request.

The above excerpt 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 from Beth because Abby did not do the request in this line (line 13). She finally gets the offer in line 14. This offer gets an acceptance as a preferred response in line 15.

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 excerpt below is shown as the example.

(11) SBL, (Schegloff, 2007, p. 92)  
 1 Abby:→ And uhm I want(ed) to ask too, do you still have a copy  
 2 of The Cro-ih Cross and the Switchblade?  
 3 Beth:→ Yeah.  
 4 Abby:→ May I read it again?  
 5 Beth: Yes, you sure may, I've got it on my bedside and I intend  
 to read it again myself, and I started it,  
 (dialogue continued)

The above excerpt shows a pre-request done in line 1 and 2. It has a go-head response instead of an offer in line 3. This response is then followed by a base sequence, a request by FPP in line 4 and the response by SPP in line 5.

### *Ambiguous actions*

The above three actions are similar to one another and sometimes it is difficult to determine which actions belong to which category. This is true since according to Schegloff (2007), "requests, offers, and invitations form a set of action types (with associated sequence types)" (p.29). This reality results in some ambiguous actions in which one action can be categorized as another action. The



fact that often one action is more preferred than another one can also lead to ambiguity. A request disguised as an offer is one example. Below is a dialogue from the literature about requests disguised as offers.

(12) (Schegloff, 2007, p. 84)

1 Betsy: And uh because I'm s'pposed to be hostess Sunday,  
 2 Alice:→Oh uh didju want relief on that.  
 3 Betsy: Well I don't know, there's nobody else down with me,  
 4 I spoke to uhm  
 5 Alice: Well, I'll- I can help you,  
 6 Betsy: Uh well, I probably it's only between twelve and  
 7 Twelve thir[ty,  
 8 Alice:→ [Yes, so that's r- I can help at that time  
 9 Betsy: Uh because uhm I think what's her name? uhm (0,4)  
 10 Alice: Oh  
 11 (0.2)  
 12 Betsy: that's on the morning?  
 13 (0.2)  
 14 Alice: Sue?  
 15 Betsy: Oh Sue Brown, I-she usually stays till eleven,  
 16 Alice: Yeah, mm hm,  
 17 Betsy: Uh and uh so uhm but I think uh that it will work  
 18 out alright, uh well, I don't know, I (thought) I  
 19 would call Maryanne, I thought I'd let her call me,  
 20 because (she hadda)day yesterday. [And-  
 21 Alice:→ [Well if you- If  
 22 you want help Sunday, I'll do it.

The above actions in lines 2, 5, 8, and 21 are ambiguous. At first, they look like offers but eventually in line 21 it turned out to be a request. In other words, the request is disguised as an offer. The offer sequences start in line 2 with a pre-offer. It has a response which can be categorized as a hedging response. Only this one, according to Schegloff, appeared encouraging (Schegloff, 2007). When the offer was finally uttered in line 5 and again in line 8, Betsy did not really accept it. Betsy's responses were full of pre-disagreements that might lead to a dispreferred response. Alice finally renews her offer in line 21. Here it is clearer that actually Alice has been trying to make a request to be allowed to work, since with a normal offer it is not usual to keep on offering something when

the signals lead to the dispreferred response. This is normal in everyday conversation since Schegloff (2007) says that requests are often treated as dispreferred and therefore, people tend to mask them as other actions- for example as offers (p.84).

### *Apology*

Apologies are important in maintaining social relationship with others. This action helps reestablish social harmony between speakers whenever one of them 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 finds four places where apologies can occur.

First, Robinson (2004) says that an apology can be done as “an initial turn-constructural 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 (Putri, 2007, p. 23). One example is an apology-prefaced question as we can see in extract 4 below.

(13) (Robinson, 2004, p. 296)

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

7 DOC: Eightee:n.

The apology prefaced question/answer sequence begins in line 4 and ends in line 6. The apology is preliminary 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).

Still according to the Robinson (2004), 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” (p.297). 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. Some examples of apology as second pair part are apology-prefaced account. Extract 5 will give an example of an apology as a second pair part which has function as a preface of an account.

(14) (Robinson, 2004, p. 299)

```

1 LES: A:re you thinking (.) o:f coming (.)to thuh meeting
2      toni:ght
3 MYR:→ >Do you know< I'm terrible sorry.> I was
4      going da ring you in a short while,<.hh I
5      hsd=a phone call from Ben. (he's/whose) down
6      in Devon.'n he's not going to get back
7      toni:ght, .h[h
8 LES:      [Yes=
9 MYR: =And mommy's going to this k-k=uh:(.)that
10     [ca:rol]      [<concert>]
11 LES: [(y)-Yes      [of course]I think my husband's
12     going to that too:.=

```

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). An example of this kind of apology is in extract 6 below.

- (15) (Robinson, 2004, p. 300)
- 1 GOR: Are you going' toni:gh=t  
 2 NOR: Mm,  
 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,]  
 8 GOR: [.ph ]hhh Pardon?=  
 9 NOR:→ =(heh) Caugh[t me in thuh ba[th  
 10 GOR:→ [.thh (O(h)h(h)I'm s(h)orr(h)y  
 11 hee=.hu-(.) .hhhh(uh/oh) well I sh'(ll) let you get  
 12 back to it,=h  
 13 (0,2)  
 14 GOR: .hhh Uh::m(.) (.th) (0.2) sh'll I expect  
 15 you about quartwe past ei:ght?  
 16 (0.7)  
 17 NOR: Ah::lb-uh) (0.8) Yeah.

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 response to this type of apology: preferred and dispreferred response. Preferred responses described by Robinson are three types: absolution, disagreeing with the need for the apology and “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 is in extract 7 which is the same as the above extract 5 only with two additional lines.

(16) (Robinson, 2004, p. 299)

1 LES: A:re you thinking(.) o:f coming(.)to thuh meeting  
 2 toni:ght.  
 3 MYR: >Do you know< I'm terrribly sorry.> I was  
 4 going da ring you in a short while,<.hh I  
 5 Had=a phone call from Ben. (he's/whose) down  
 6 in Devon.'n he's not going to get back  
 7 Toni:ght, .h[h  
 8 LES: [Yes=  
 9 MYR: =And mommy's going to this k-k-=uh:(.)that  
 10 [ca:rol] [<concert>]  
 11 LES: [(y)-Yes] [of course]I think my husband's  
 12 going to that too:.=  
 13 MYR:→ =I'm dreadfully sorry.  
 14 LES:→ ↑That's a'ri:ght,↓

The apology in line 13 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's okay* or *It's cool*.

The next preferred response, disagreeing with the need of apology can be seen in extract 8 which is a continuation of the above extract 5.

(17) (Robinson, 2004, p. 305)

1 MYR:→ Oh I'm dreadfully sorry ab[out it,]>I w's-<]  
 2 LES:→ [↑No, n ]o↓ ]  
 3 MYR: >(i[ts]in fact-<)  
 4 LES:→ [↑(It's) en]ded).↓

Here, Les in line 2 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 (extract 5). 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 a 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 Les rejects 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) mentions, "*oh* preface to a response to an apology can display the respondent's understanding that the action of apologizing was irrelevant or inappropriate" (p.301). 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). Example of this dispreferred response is in extract 9 below.

(18) (Robinson, 2004, p. 309)

```

1 DOC:→      Hello: s[orry I'm running] late.
2 PAT:        [Hi:                ]
3     →      (.)
4 DOC:        'T's a typical Monday
5 PAT:→      Oh you're not running (late)=
6 DOC:        =(N)ot doin' too ba:d,
7 PAT:        No:::
```

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 10 line 7 below.

(19) (Robinson, 2004, p. 317)

1 NAN: <Wul> wh:at=a sh↑a:me↓>Did ya<have ta go in  
 2 thuh hos↑pita[l?↓]  
 3 EMA: [ N:]o:: I just had a local  
 4 de:al,=an':=uh I'wa(d)n't any fu:n but I'm  
 5 better I w's: lying on thuh couch out in  
 6 f[ront.]  
 7 NAN:→ [Oh: ]:I'm so:rr[y E:m]ma:?  
 8 EMA: [Ah:..]  
 9 EMA:→ I:am too.>why=(d)on'<=cha come an' see me.=  
 10 NAN: =.h We:ll=I=was gunna call an'ask you if..

And also “sorry” to initiate repair, as shown in extract 10 below.

(20) (Robinson, 2004, p. 318)

((Telephone Rings))

1 LES: Hello::↓  
 2 MOM: ↑Hello::↓  
 3 (.)  
 4 MOM: (Leslie?)  
 5 (0.2)  
 6 LES:→ Sor↑ry:↓?  
 7 (0.2)  
 8 MOM:→ Leslie?  
 9 (.)  
 10 LES:Oh yeah. Sorry.=I couldn't hear you very [well.Jem]'s m-  
 11 MOM: [ (Oh:) ]  
 12 LES: (m)=[Jem:m's-

13 MOM: [Are (your)<fam]ily>o:ff?

## 2.5. Related Studies

As the teacher Noerhayati Ika Putri, M.A had done the study of Conversation Analysis. She examines the dialogues from many textbooks that are mostly used in Indonesia and broader Southeast Asia. She chose to analyze textbooks for pre-intermediate through advanced levels. She focused on the analysis preferred and dispreferred response. She also use CA research in order to know how teachers in teaching communicative English in the EFL context like Indonesia and / other Southeast Asia countries.

The study of Conversation Analysis in conversation had done by Jean Wong (2002). The title of her journal is “Applying” conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbook<sup>1</sup>. Wong’s studies is similar with the writer’ because it was also conducted with Conversation Analysis as the methodology. Here, CA is used to evaluate the naturalness or authenticity of textbook “conversation”. This study continues a search for how to “apply” conversation analysis in applied linguistics, looking to see what there is to unbundle and unbridle, to understand and appreciate, with respect to talk, language pedagogy, and the classroom context. Therefore, CA is the best method to achieve the aim of her study.