

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Conversation Analysis

One of the fundamental approaches that is mostly used in the study of talking and interaction in all kinds of conversation is Conversational Analysis (CA). Conversational analysis deals with how communicative acts interact with each other in real communication. Conversational analysis is concerned with describing the methods by which people of culture engage in social interaction to reveal organized practices or patterns of action, under the assumption that interaction is structurally organized. Understanding interaction in the particular setting can be enhanced by the findings of Conversation Analysis (CA). Historically, the origins of CA are in sociology and can be traced to a paper on the organization of turn-taking in conversation, which was written in the mid 1970s by Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974). Later, Levinson made a study of conversational structure in his great book *Pragmatics* (1983), in which preference organization was discussed. Other scholars made their contributions to the study of preference organization. For example, George Yule identified the patterns associated with a dispreferred second in English as a series of optional elements (2000, p.81). Mey generalized from examples that “in conversational interchanges, not all second parts in an adjacency relationship are of equal structural complexity” (2001, p. 151), and discussed the “markedness”. As a

matter of fact, Conversation Analysis treats the transitions between turns during talk-in-interaction as revealing two kinds of things. First, of all the 'next turn' is the place where speakers display their understanding of the first turn possible completion. Thus, it displays the result of an analysis that the next speaker has performed on the type utterance that the first speaker has produced. Another aspect of that is the relationship between turns which reveals how the participants actively analyze the ongoing production of talk in order to negotiate their own situated participation in it.

The present paper aims at analyzing the use of preferred and dispreferred response in four action sequences dialogues in the eighth grade Junior High School English textbooks in order to evaluate the accuracy of the dialogues in the eighth grade Junior High School English textbooks according to the structures of talk in CA theory.

## **2.2 Adjacency Pairs**

Adjacency pairs are sequences of at least two turns in length, and they consist of at least two turns in length, and they consist of at least two parts. The first pair part (FPP) is produced by the first speaker and the other is produced by the second pair part (SPP). The parts are relatively ordered and discriminately related that the second part must be an appropriate pair to the first (Silverman, 1998). The sequence involve immediate next turns where the parts are conditionally relevant to each other. In other word, we can state that adjacency pair is a term to describe the way in which conversation can be segmented into

pairs of exchanges that are connected in some way although spoken by different speakers. For example: a question requires an answer, a greeting requires greeting, an offer requires acceptance or rejection, etc. Such as:

(1) (Goffman, 1981, p.47)

Doctor : Are you sleeping well?  
 Patient : No, not all  
 Doctor : Hmm. That could be the problem.

From the sequences above, we can state that the Doctor takes turn as the first pair part, and then the patient's response takes place as the second pair part followed by the doctor's follow up. Furthermore, Sacks examined and detailed the phenomenon he termed adjacency pairs or "utterance pairs" (Sacks, 1995, p. 104). Adjacency pairs were shown to be ordered such that the two parts normally occur next to each other, and the use of the first part of the pair is regularly followed by the second (Sacks, 1995, p. 667). Adjacency pairs involve the display of mutual understanding such that the absence of the second part is relevant and subject to inference. Thus adjacency pairs exhibit conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1968, cited in Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 42). This involves a normative aspect in a number of senses. Motivational inferences may be drawn in the absence of the second pair part, the second part need not occur immediately following the first part and dispreferred responses are marked (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The first part of the pair as well as the second may be viewed as constrained in that to get the second you may need to initiate the first (Silverman, 1998).

A complementary notion in a conversation is preference. Preference refers to the fact that there may be alternative forms of second part replies. Some

adjacency pairs with preferred and dispreferred second-pair parts are: offer-accept/decline, accusation-rebuttal/justification, assessment-agreement/disagreement, self-deprecation-disagreement/agreement; accusation-denial/admission and request-acceptance/refusal. Preferred actions can be defined as ways that are culturally expected; and they are typically done in a sequence. Meanwhile, dispreferred response can be defined as ways that are not expected, but they are not necessarily rude if it phrased properly (Mey, 2001). Nevertheless, the characteristics of preferred and dispreferred response will be discussed in next part since the writer considered that those responses are very important in the structure of talk and they display user's awareness of the relevance of the rule.

### **2.3 Preferred and Dispreferred responses**

As has been explained on the previous part that there might be alternative form which produced by the second pair part; they are preferred and dispreferred responses. As a matter of fact, it is very important to identify the differences between those two terms, not as a psychological orientation, but as a referring structural relationship of sequence parts (Schegloff, 2007). Moreover, Schegloff (2007, p.61) states that preferred and dispreferred responses are not a matter of motives of desire or likings of participants, whether speakers or recipients, first or second pair part, but preferred and dispreferred refer to the structural relationship of sequence parts. For example, an acceptance for an invitation to a party is considered as a preferred response which is not affected by the fact whether the

speaker likes the recipient or not, or whether the speaker prefers the recipient to come to the party or not. However, no matter what a personal preference of the speaker is, it will not affect the fact that an acceptance is a preferred response and a refusal is a dispreferred response for an invitation. It happens also in other actions like requests, where an acceptance is the preferred response, whereas a refusal is the dispreferred one (Levinson, 1983; Heritage, 1984).

#### *Characteristics of preferred responses*

A preferred response is generally delivered promptly, brief and straight to the point. In terms of position, for example a preferred response is delivered in a natural way which means that the second pair part's response take turn after the first pair part. In addition, this type of response is linguistically unmarked (Levinson, 1983). Hence, preferred response does not have a complex pattern since producing preferred response is not difficult because preferred response usually done in a simply way and uncomplicated turn. Regarding the term of acceptance as a preferred response, there are two characteristic of preferred responses according to CA, simple, straightforward and no delay was drawn from the extract below:

(2) (Jiang, 2000, p.269)

1 A : Why don't you come up and see me some times?  
2 B : I would like to. (Jiang, 2000, p. 269)

Moreover, Schegloff (2007) figures out that preferred response are likely to be short and straight to the point, and unordinarily treated as accountable which

means that the response is required to give an explanation of the first pair part's actions.

#### *Characteristic of dispreferred response*

In contrast, the characteristics of dispreferred response are more complex than preferred response. Therefore, there are several characteristics presented to evaluate the accuracy of dispreferred response in eighth grade junior high school's English textbook. Schegloff (2007) classifies some group of characteristics which can be used to identify the dispreferred response, such as mitigation, elaboration, default and positioning.

In addition, Levinson (1983) also described some similar characteristics of dispreferred response which integrate delays, prefaces, accounts and declination component as the signal of dispreferred response.

#### *Mitigation and elaboration*

Dispreferred response might be mitigated or attenuated. The dispreferred response are never expressed obviously compared to the preferred response which is always expressed clearly as shown in the following instance:

(3) (Sacks, 1987 [1973], p.60; Schegloff, 2007, p.64)

1 A: Is it near Edinburgh?  
2 B: Edinburgh? It's not too far

From the sequences above, the first pair has been asked to the second pair about the distance of certain place. But the second pair's answer is designed to mitigate and attenuated the distance and it is produced to prevent disalignment

(Schegloff, 2007, p.64). Unlike preferred response which is short and simple, dispreferred response is elaborated. Nevertheless, mitigated and elaborated might occur in the dispreferred response under this following condition:

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 (Wow, it's a beautiful house)
  - c. Apologies (I'm sorry)
  - d. Disclaimer (I don't know) etc.

(Schegloff, 2007; Levinson, 1983)

Further, the preface above can be notified as delays regarding they avoid the response from being contiguous with the first pair part.

### *Delay*

As has been described before, preferred responses tend to act in a short and simple way. But, they sometimes come early in the next turn and be placed contiguously (Sacks, 1995). In contrast, dispreferred responses usually come with delayed responses. Dealing with its 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 the first pair part and the second pair part in base sequences. The insertion sequence is needed so that the second pair part speaker can give 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 (Putri, 2007, p.14).

Through the following instance, we can see examples of mitigation and elaboration (account, appreciation), and inter-turn gap 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 : [□ (Uh huh. ) □ ] =  
12 Nan : = from'er en . hhhhA: nd uhm



*Preemptive reformulation with preference reversal*

Generally, most of the speaker can easily recognize the signals of an upcoming dispreferred response and then try to reinvent the first pair part. Hence, the preference organization for the second pair part is reversed. Before the dispreferred response reveal, the speakers reinvent the turn so that the second pair part of dispreferred response can be said in a preferred way (Putri, 2007, p.15). In addition, Schegloff (2007) states that if the first pair part talks again, then reasks the question with reversed preference may occur. By doing so, the speaker can prevent face-threat by giving the second pair part chance in saying the dispreferred response in a preferred way. Further, preemptive reformulation with preference reversal occurred in excerpt (3). In line 7, Emma reformed her invitation because she noticed the signals of dispreferred response which occurred in line 4,5,6.

Then, Emma elaborated her invitation by giving explanation what she had that might attract Nan (in line 3). Nevertheless, since there were some silences occurred in line 4 and 6, and an appreciation for the invitation which was prefaced by turn-initial delay well in line 5, Emma decided to repeat her invitation request by asking whether Nan had something else to do that could prevent her from accepting the invitation. Given this question, Nan could attenuate 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*

The characteristic of pro forma agreement is a combination of agreement + disagreement. The agreement which produced by the first pair part is shown as a delay which might be included as the *delay* characteristics to dispreferred response. It indicates that there is no silence there, but it delays the actual dispreferred response. Hence, it is familiar to see combinations like “yes, but...”, etc (Putri, 2007, pp. 15-16). The following extract 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, p.63 cited in Schegloff,2007, p. 66)

- 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**

Through this following section, the writer is going to summarize four action sequences that are discussed on this research: invitation, requests, offers, and apologies. Nevertheless, it is quite difficult to differentiate among invitation, requests and offer actions due to the fact that invitation can be viewed as a sub-class of offers and requests can also sometimes be disguised as offers. Meanwhile, apology is quite distinct from those three actions. Through this part, the writer will give detail explanation about action sequences like invitations, offers, requests, apologies, and also ambiguous actions are explained.

### *Invitation*

Invitations are actions that are normally found in the real-life conversation. Knowing how to invite people appropriately is considered important in order to socialize with others and maintain their relationship. Specifically, before the first pair part invite the second pair part, the first pair part will produce pre-invitation, one form of pre-sequence before the main action *invitation*. Schegloff (2007) states “preliminaries that project such specific imminent First Pair Parts (FPPs) are called type-specific pre-sequence” (p.28-29). Moreover, there are two functions of pre-invitation: first, to project the possibilities that the invitation will be produced; second, it makes relevant next the production of second pair part (response to pre-invitation). Some example of pre-invitation are: “*what are you doing*” or “*are you studying?*”. Due to that fact, pre-invitation is as important as invitation since they both can not be separated in the invitation action.

In addition, pre-invitation have three types of responses, they are: go-ahead, hedging, and blocking responses (Schegloff, 2007). First, a go-ahead response maintains the recipient of the response to go-ahead along with the invitation. For example:

(Mey, 2001)

X : Are you doing anything?  
Y : No, I'm just reading

The use of ‘just’ in return to ‘are you doing anything?’ is rather frequent and has generated some interest. In this case, ‘just’ is the sort of a thing: the question has been heard as a pre-invitation and the second pair part go along with the invitation. Second, a blocking response accommodates the recipient to

recognize the possibility that the invitation will be rejected, such as: I'm busy tonight' in return to 'what are you doing tonight?'. The third type of pre-invitation response is hedging in which can take the form of 'why'. Beside that, in hedging responses, the recipient can not really know whether the invitations will be declined or accepted. Nevertheless, Schegloff (2007, p. 25) states that the hedging response can make a full response contingent on what the invitation is going to be. This following extract shows the combination among hedging, go-ahead and blocking response.

(6) (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?]

In line 2, the first arrow express "what 'r you doing", shows the pre-invitation, and followed by the response in line 3 which combines the blocking response and a hedging response of an invitation. Schegloff (2007) also pointed out 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).

Further, a preferred response to an invitation is considered as an acceptance, while a dispreferred response is considered as a rejection. It's due to the acceptance symbolizes an alignment with the first pair part of an invitation sequence whereas the rejection shows a disalignment from the invitation (Schegloff, 2007).

*Offer*

Recognizing an offer and understanding how to respond it appropriately is considered important to be taught. Actually, offer and invitation are quite similar to each other in terms of the pre-sequences called pre-offers, an acceptance response (preferred response) and a rejection (dispreferred response). In pre-offers, the speaker who have something to offer will try to assess whether their offers will be accepted or not, and the offers will depend on the response of pre-offers. (Schegloff, 2007). Similar to pre-invitations, pre-offers also have three kinds of response: go-ahead, blocking, and hedging response. This following extract 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 occurs in line 4 where Gar says that he has a thermometer after Cathy's statement when she wants to buy a thermometer. Gar's statement was heard by Cathy's as a pre-offer and she responds to it in the following sequence (in line 3) which was considered as a go-ahead response. Besides, the offer itself was done in 6 where Gar offer to use his thermometer and Cathy accepts his offer which reflected as a preferred response (preferred response-acceptance) in line 7. The following extract describes pre-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

The previous extract described that Peter and Marcus are discussing about a meeting that they are going to attend. Marcus produces an offer in line 4, where he tries to offer a ride to Peter. This pre-offer gets a blocking response made by Peter in line 6 which shows that Peter is able to go to the meeting by himself. Due to this response, Marcus decides not to continue his offer.

In addition, pre-offer is then considered very useful in deciding whether the best sequences, the offer can be done or not. Nevertheless, not all the shift from pre-sequence to base sequence can always run smooth, as shown in the extract below:

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

1 Debbie : '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 too, I set it up  
 4 Debbie : Oh rea: ly ^Already?  
 5 Nick : Mm hmm  
 6           (0.5)  
 7 Debbie : Are you kidding?  
 8 Nick : No, well I ordered it last (week) / (spring)  
 9           (0.5)  
 10 Debbie : Oh-no but you h- you've got it already?  
 11 Nick : Yeah h! hh+ ((laughing))  
 12 Debbie : =hhh [hh 'hh] ((laughing))  
 13 Nick : [ I just] said that  
 14 Debbie : O : : hh: hu [h, I just couldn't be[lieve you  
           c-  
 15 Nick : [Oh (it's just) [It'll sink in 'n two



(Schegloff, 2007). The extract below describes how a pre-request acquire 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 to say?  
 10 Beth : Uh I Believe in Miracles  
 11 Abby : → I say do you have it?  
 12 Beth : Yes.  
 13 Abby : Uh hun  
 14 Beth : And I'll be glad to (.let you have it (a  
           week'r two).  
 15 Abby : Yes I'd like to cits an offer rather than  
           request.

The extract above shows two pre-requests occur in a sequence; those are in line 9 and line 11. Nevertheless, there is a signal produced by Abby in line 13 to acknowledge the agreement to the pre-request that she does in both lines before Beth does the offer. It indicates that Abby was orienting to an offer from Beth because Abby did not do the request in that sequence (in line 13). Then Abby finally gets the offer from Beth and this offer gets an acceptance as a preferred response in line 15.

Furthermore, the second next preferred response of a pre-request is a go-ahead one. If an offer is not received, then a go-ahead which then leads to a request can be produced, as shown in the following extract:



(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 : → Teah  
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.

The above extract shows a pre-request was occurred in line 1 and 2. Afterwards, it turns to go-ahead response instead of an offer in line 3. This response is then followed by a base sequence, a request which produced by the first pair part (Abby) in line 4 and followed by the preferred response produced by second pair part (Beth) in line 5.

*Ambiguous actions.*

As has been explained before that invitation, offer and request are identical to one another and sometimes it is difficult to verify which action belong to which category. As a matter of fact, Schegloff (2007) states that request, offer, and invitation form a set of action types (with associated sequence types) (p.29). This fact is occurred in some ambiguous action in which one action can be categorized as another action. In addition, the fact that usually considered more preferred than another one can also lead to ambiguity. For example: a request disguised as an offer- as described in the following excerpt:

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

- 1 Betsy : And uh because I'm s'pposed to be hostess  
Sunday,  
2 Alice : → Oh uh didju want refief on that  
3 Betsy : Well I don't know, there's nobody else down  
4 with me,I spoke to uhm

5 Alice : Well, I'll - I can help you  
6 Betsy : Uh well, 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 extract is the evidence of the request which is disguised as an offer. In line 2, 5, 8, and 21 are ambiguous. Firstly, they seem offering but ultimately in line 21 it changes into a request. Actually, the-pre-offer sequence starts in line 2. Then, it has a response which can be categorized as a hedging response. When the offer is finally uttered in line 5 and re-offer in line 8, Betsy did not really accept it. In contrast, Betsy's response was considered as a pre-disagreement which then lead to a dispreferred response. Further, Alice finally re-offers in line 21. From this sequence we can see clearly that actually Alice has been trying to make a request to be allowed work, regarding in a normal offer, it is inappropriate to keep offering something when the signals lead to the dispreferred response. This circumstance is normally happen in our daily conversation since Schegloff (2007) states that requests are often treated as dispreferred and therefore, people tend to mask as other action, such as offers (p.84).



The apology prefaced question/answer sequence occurs in line 4 and ends in line 6. The apology is preliminary action to another action which asking for information. The doctor apologizes (in line 4) because she might have stated before and 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 the action of being accomplished (answering the question in line 4 and 5).

Second, Robinson (2004) states that an apology can be happen as a second pair where it is “preliminary and subordinate to the primary action of this turn.” (p.297). In other words, we can say that the second position of apology is done as a second pair part of the adjacency pair. Further, if there is no response to the apology, it means that it is just preface to the responses to the first pair part. In the following extract, we can clearly see an example of an apology as a second pair part which has a 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 of apology-prefaced account occurs in line 3. The account was a response to the question in the previous line 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 which organized the actions (e.g. complaints) (Robinson, 2004).

An example below shows kind of apology:

(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'right'  
 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)orry(h)y  
 11 : hee=.hu-(.) .hhhh (uh/oh) well I sh'(ll) let  
       you get  
 12 : back to it,=h  
 13 : (0.7)  
 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 line 7 and 9. The action of apologize 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).

Fourth, an apology takes place as a first pair part in which apologizing is a primary action. Robinson (2004) also states that an apology solicits response. Further, there are two types of response in this type of apology: preferred and dispreferred response. According to Robinson (2004), there are three types of preferred responses: 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 occurs in the following extract:

(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 terrible 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 that stands by itself and the response in line 14 is an absolution. Beside the expression “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 the following extract which is a continuation of the above extract (15):

(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). ↓

In addition, in line 2, Les disagree 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. Therefore, Les disagree by

saying NO after the Myr's apology in line 1. Due to this term, it 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 considered very uncommon in real life conversation) that indicates that Les rejects Myr's apology. But in this case, Les says "*No*" which refers to the need to do the apology again since Myr has done it before.

The last type of preferred response is an "oh"-prefaced preferred response. Robinson (2004) describes that "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*". On the other hand, 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 follow an apology-relevant response" (p.39). Below is the example of dispreferred response:

(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. Lastly, 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 infrequently happens in natural occurring data. This might be related to the function of the apology itself which is to maintain a relationship.

Nevertheless, the actual dispreferred response could often happen to be meant as a joke and not to be taken seriously. Besides, there seems to be less data of this kind of action where people show serious offenses. Further, "sorry" could also be used for other actions. There are two other actions which are explained by Robinson: sorry to express personal regret or sympathy as in the following extract:

- (19) (Robinson, 2004, p. 371)
- 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:rry [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

Furthermore, "sorry" to initiate repair, as shown in extract 19 below.

- (20) (Robinson, 2004, p. 318)
- ((Telephone Rings))
- 1 LES : Hello : : : ↓  
 2 MOM : °↑Hello : : : ↓°  
 3 (.)  
 4 MOM : °(Leslie?)°



- 5 (0.2)  
 6 LES :→ Sorrry: ↓?  
 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

Conversation analysis (CA) is an integral part of the study of language in communication, in which preference organization is one of the most important topics for discourse research. This research investigates the use of preferred and dispreferred response in eighth grade junior high school English textbook. In addition, there are some studies which provided detail information about preferred and dispreferred response in conversation. Noerhayati Ika Putri, M.A (2007) 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. Moreover, she focused on the analysis of preferred and dispreferred response. She also uses CA research in order to know how the teachers in teaching communicative English in the EFL context like Indonesia and/other Southeast countries.

Another study of Conversation Analysis was conducted by Zhang Ping (2007). The title of her journal is “On preferred and dispreferred second turns in interaction”. Ping’s studies is similar with the writer’ because it was also

conducted with Conversation Analysis as the methodology. In her study, CA is used to evaluate the naturalness of the people's actual conversations. It is concluded that in actual conversations, the speaker may make a preferred or dispreferred response in either marked or unmarked form according to the speaker's intention and conversation circumstances. Therefore, CA is the most appropriate method to achieve the aim of her study.