

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Theories are important as the basic parts of research and as references in identifying and analyzing the data. As the writer has stated, in this chapter, she is going to present linguistics theories concerning adjacency pairs and action sequences by Schegloff (2007). After the writer obtains the main theory and the supporting theory, she will present the review of the related studies that suits her research, namely from Rahmawati's, Swandayani's and Evangelina's studies; each research is correlated with the writer's study. Rahmawati (2007) analyzed An analysis on Sequences Organization (Offer and Request) in Indonesian Conversation. Furthermore, Swandayani (2011) studied about A Study on the Pre-Sequence and Politeness Strategies of Making Request in the Conversation between Transgenders to Their Guest. The last, Evangelina (2009) studied about Pre-sequence used by English Department students and their interlocutors in daily conversation. The writer gives a brief summary about each of those researches.

#### **2.1 Conversation Analysis**

Conversation Analysis known as one of approaches that are usually used as the study of talk and other forms conduct (including the description of the body in gesture, posture, facial expression and on going activities in the setting) in all forms of interaction. Conversation Analysis focuses primarily on talk, but integrates also non verbal aspects of interaction in its research design (Schegloff,

2007). CA paradigm examines the rules of conversation aspects such as repair, adjacency pair, topic initiation, openings and closings, preference organization, insertion and post expansion (Paltridge, 2000). Conversation analysis is an approach or the study of social interaction, which emerged in 1960s from the research collaboration of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (Sidnell, 2007). Sacks observe that there are norms concerning where in conversation certain kinds of activities should happen. Conversation Analysis aims to describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life (Sidnell, 2010, p.1).

Even though Conversation analysis is interested in talk, it is only marginally in language as such: its object of study is better describe as the interactional organization of social activities (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p.12). It is also corresponds with Sidnell (2009) statement that Conversation analysis is an approach to the study of the social interaction tat focuses on practise of speaking that across a range of context and settings.

Schegloff (2007) states the structure that have been found in conversation analysis such as adjacency pairs. Every conversational action of speech occurs in a sequence of utterances between two or more people who all shape what they say around what has already been said and what they predict might be said later on in the conversation.

## 2.2 Adjacency Pairs

Schegloff (2007) reveals that adjacency pairs are one of the most important parts in conversation analysis in which an utterance made by one speaker is responded by another utterance from another speaker. Adjacency pairs are deeply inter-related with the turn-taking system as technique for selecting a next speaker. Besides, Yule (1996) states that adjacency pairs help in the process of conversation by the fact that there are many almost automatic patterns in the structure of conversation (p.77). According to Schegloff (2007), adjacency pairs possess the following features; there are two utterances which are long. The first utterance must belong to the class of first pair parts; the utterances are ordered. Meanwhile, the second utterance belongs to the class of second pair parts; the utterances are related, in which not every second pair part can properly follow any first pair part (p.13).

Adjacency pairs are differentiated into first pair parts and second pair parts (2007, p.13). First pair parts include utterance types such as question, request, and other utterance type-types which initiate some exchange. Furthermore, second pair parts involve utterance types such as answer, reject, accept, agree or disagree, and other utterance type- types which are responsive to the action of a prior turn. In addition, according to Yule (1996), there are other classifications of adjacency pairs, namely, response, thanking and goodbye.

Based on the study of McCarthy (1991), pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent. It is possible to state the requirements, in a normal conversational sequence, for many types of utterances, in terms of what is

expected as a response and what certain responses presuppose. It means that a question expects an answer, or a greeting expects a greeting.

Example:

A: Good Morning	(Greeting)
B: Good Morning	(Greeting)
X: Would you like some coffee?	(Offer)
Y: Yes, thank you	(Acceptance)

Two brief conversations above are some examples of adjacency pairs happening in daily conversation. The first example is ‘greeting-greeting’ type, where A is the first pair parts and B is the second pair parts. Then, the second example is ‘offer-acceptance’ type, in which X is the first pair parts and Y is the second pair parts.

In addition, Sacks classifies a class of first pair part according to second part’s option as follows.

- a. Reciprocity: First pair part requires a solution from second pair part.

**Greeting-Greeting:** It is the first expression used when seeing somebody or waiting for somebody. Yet, in particular communities, it can be defined as fabricated expression.

Example:

A: Good Morning	(Greeting)
B: Good Morning	(Greeting)

- b. One appropriate second: First pair part requires one possible answer from second pair part.

**Question-Answer**

**Example:**

A: What are you doing? (Question)

B: No worries man (Answer)

- c. More than one: First pair part requires more than one answer from second pair part.

**Complaint-Apology/Anticipation:** It is the way to express that one is annoyed or not satisfied about something.

**Example:**

A: Hey, you ruined my clothes! (Complaint)

B: I'm sorry, I don't mean it (Apology)

A: Your work is awful (Complaint)

B: I'll do better next time (Anticipation)

**Challenge-Accept/Refuse:** It is a summons that is often threatening, provocative, simulating or inciting; a summons to a duel to answer an affront. It is also an invitation to compete in sport.

**Example:**

A: Come on. Let's have a match tomorrow (Challenge)

B: Be my guest (Accept)

A: Can you beat that (my score)? (Challenge)

B: Sorry, no time for playing (Refuse)

**Offer-Accept/Decline:** It is a presentation of something for acceptance.

**Example:**

A: Please stay for a while. (Offer)

B: Okay (Accept)

A: Do you want a piece of candy? (Offer)

B: No, thanks (Decline)

**Request-Grant/Rejection:** It is an act of asking for something.

**Example:**

A: Can I borrow your car? (Request)

B: Sure (Grant)

A: Can I borrow your car? (Request)

B: Well.. I dunno (Reject)

**Invitation-Accept/Refuse:** It is the act of invitations. It asks someone to go or to come to somewhere.

**Example:**

A: Come to my house tomorrow. (Invite)

B: With pleasure. (Accept)

A: Will you come to my party tomorrow? (Invite)

B: I am sorry, I can't go there. (Refuse)

Different types of very complex conversation patterns can be created through the use of adjacency pairs. Presequences can be used as initial enquiries to obtain information that will help the person decide how their next pair part will be answered. Schegloff (1972) therefore states that the term adjacency pairs is inaccurate as they are not always found next to each other in everyday conversation and also that the relationship between the first and second pair parts is conditionally relevant.

**2.3 Action Sequences**

Across all the different kinds of action implemented through talk, there are any sort of general patterns or structures used to co-produce and track an orderly stretch of talk and other conduct in which some courses of action get initiated, are worked through and brought to closure called as sequences (Schegloff, 2007).The

main idea of this thesis is Action sequences. In action sequences, the writer is focusing on: invitation, requests, offers, apologies and announcement.

### 2.3.1 Invitation

Pre-sequences come before different kinds of first pair parts, such as invitation, offer, request, and other kind of first pair parts. Schegloff (2007) states preliminaries that project such specific imminent first pair parts are called type-specific pre-sequences (p.29). There are two functions of pre-invitations, such as to project the possibility that a basefirst pair part (invitation) will be produced and also make relevant to the next production of second pair part (response to pre-invitation) (2007, p.29). According to Schegloff (2007), pre-invitations have three types of responses: go-ahead, hedging, and blocking responses.

The first type is a go-ahead response. A go-ahead response supports the recipient of the response to go-ahead with the invitations. It means that the inviter will get a positive response to continue their other conversation, which is an invitation action. Here is the example of a go-ahead response to a pre-invitation:

(Nelson is the caller; Clara is called to the phone)

- 1 Cla: Hello
- 2 Nel: Hi.
- 3 Cla: Hi.
- 4 Nel: Fpre→ Whatcha doin'.
- 5 Cla: Spre→ Not much.
- 6 Nel: Fb → Y'wanna drink?
- 7 Cla: Sb → Yeah.
- 8 Nel: Okay.

The question “Whatcha doin”asked by Nelson in line 4 is one form which represents the pre-invitation and is responded “Not much” by Clara in line 5. Therefore, Nelson does indeed go ahead to issue the invitation he thinks will be

accepted. He then produces the first pair parts “Y’ wanna drink?” in line 6 and Clara responds it with “Yeah” in line 7. As Nelson could predict Clara’s response, it can be indicated that his invitation is accepted.

The second class or type of response proposed by Schegloff (2007) is the blocking response. On the contrary, a blocking response helps the recipient to know the possibility that the invitation will be declined or rejected. An example of blocking response to a pre-invitation is given below:

(Allen/Judy are married; John is Judy’s fellow student)

1 ring  
 2 All: Hello?  
 3 Joh: Yeah, is Judy there?  
 4 All: Yeah, just a second.  
 5 ((silence))  
 6 Jud: Hello,  
 7 Joh: Judy?  
 8 Jud: Yeah,  
 9 Joh: John Smith.  
 10 Jud: Hi John.  
 11 Joh: F<sub>pre</sub>→ Ha you doin-<say what ’r you doing.  
 12 Jud: S<sub>pre</sub>→ Well, we’re going out.

John takes a sequence “Ha you doin-<say what ’r you doing.” in line 10 which represents the pre-invitation. Schegloff (2007) explains that the caller asks, just 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 delivers his pre invitation in line 10, Judy responds John’s pre-invitation in line 11 with “Well, we’re going out.”. This sequence shows that Judy is not available to accept an invitation; it puts a blockage in the way of issuing the invitation.

The last type of response is hedging, in which the recipient cannot really



know whether the invitations will be declined or accepted. When recipients respond to a first pair part of pre-sequence with “why”, they are showing that they recognize the talk related to a projected first pair part, but their response will depend on invitation, offer and request. However, Schegloff (2007) suggests that hedging response can make a full response contingent on what the invitation is going to be (p.25). Afterwards, a hedging response can come in the form of response type combination. The combination of hedging and blocking response in this conversation may be used as one of the examples of various responses to a pre-invitation.

- 1 Jud: Hi John.
- 2 Joh: F<sub>pre</sub>→ Ha you doin-<say what 'r you doing.
- 3 Jud: S<sub>pre</sub>→ Well, we're going out. Why.
- 4 Joh: → Oh, I was just gonna say come out and come over
- 5 → here and talk this evening, [but if you're going=
- 6 Jud: [“Talk,” you mean get
- 7 [drunk, don't you?]
- 8 Joh: =[out you can't very] well do that.

The first arrow in line 2, “what'r you doing”, indicates that pre-invitation occurs, then it is responded by Judy in line 3 using a combination between a blocking response and a hedging response. The next arrow in line 4 shows the response to the hedging which is similar to an invitation. This response shows what an invitation is going to be. Schegloff (2007) also concludes that the result of pre-invitations can be no base invitation sequence is done or there is a follow up invitation sequence (p.28).

### 2.3.2 Offer

Offer is an action in which a speaker proposes something to other speaker in a conversation (Schegloff, 2007). Stenstrom (1994) proposes that both offer and invitation are the acts of submitting something for acceptance. It can be defined roughly in the same way; nonetheless, they are not doing exactly the same thing in the interaction. Offer and invitation are similar in which both of them have pre-sequences. According to Schegloff (2007), in pre-offers, those who have something to offer will try to assess whether their offer will be accepted or not and that the offer will depend on the response of the pre-offer. Comparable to pre-invitation, pre-offerresponse is also divided into three kinds of response: go-ahead, blocking and hedging.

1 Cat: I'm gonna buy a thermometer though [because I=  
 2 Les: [But-  
 3 Cat: =think she's [(got a temperature).  
 4 Gar: F<sub>pre</sub> → [We have a thermometer.  
 5 Cat: S<sub>pre</sub> → (Yih do?)  
 6 Gar: F<sub>b</sub> → Wanta use it?  
 7 Cat: S<sub>b</sub> → Yeah.  
 8 (3.0)

The arrow in line 4 indicates pre-offer occurs when Gary announces that he has a thermometer after Cathy's statement to buy one. This is heard by Cathy as a pre-offer and she responds it with a go-ahead response that occurs in line 5. The offer itself is done in line 6 to indicate the acceptance. The example of pre-offer with a blocking response is shown below:

1 Peter : I'll see ya Tuesday.  
 2 Marcus : Right.  
 3 Peter : O[k a y Marcus ]  
 4 Marcus : F<sub>pre</sub>→ [You- you're al]right [you can get there.

5 Peter : [Ye-  
 6 Peter : S<sub>pre</sub>→ Yeah  
 7 Marcus : Okay  
 8 Peter : Okay

In the transcription above, Peter and Marcus have been talking about the meeting they are going to attend. Marcus is trying to offer a ride to Peter but before doing that, he makes a pre-offer in line 4. This pre-offer then gets a blocking response by Peter in line 6 which 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 transcriptions below show this problem:

Debbie and Nick, 1:34-2:59  
 1 Deb: 'hhh Um:: u- guess what I've-(u-)wuz lookin' in  
 2 F<sub>pre</sub>→ the paper:--have you got your waterbed yet?  
 3 Nic: S<sub>pre</sub>→ Uh huh, it's really nice °too, I set it up  
 4 Deb: Oh rea:lly? ^Alre:ady?  
 5 Nic: Mm hmm  
 6 (0.5)  
 7 Deb: Are you kidding?  
 8 Nic: No, well I ordered it last (week)/(spring)  
 9 (0.5)  
 10 Deb: Oh- no but you h- you've got it already?  
 11 Nic: Yeah h! hh= ((laughing))  
 12 Deb: =hhh [hh `hh] ((laughing))  
 13 Nic: [I just] said that  
 14 Deb: O::hh: hu[h, I couldn't be[lieve you c-  
 15 Nic: [Oh ( °it's just) [It'll sink in 'n two  
 16 day[s fr'm now (then )((laugh))]  
 17 Deb: → [ ((l a u g h)) ] Oh no cuz I just  
 18 → got- I saw an ad in the paper for a real discount

19 → waterbed s' I w'z gonna tell you 'bout it=  
 20 Nic: =No this is really, you (haven't seen) mine, you'll  
 21 really like it.  
 22 Deb: Ya:h. It's on a frame and everythi[ng]?  
 23 Nic: [Yeah  
 24 Deb: 'hh Uh (is) a raised frame?  
 25 Nic: °mm hmm  
 26 Deb: How: ni:::ce,

The transcription above shows a pre-offer in line 2 and it is responded by Nick as the second pair part with a blocking response in line 3. This blocking response is then repeated several times since Debbie keeps 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 reveals 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.

### 2.3.3 Request

Request is an act that asks the addressee to do something or to let the speaker do something and expects to be accepted (Stenstrom, 1994). A request is another type of action sequences that has similarities with the previous two actions: invitation and offer. 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 person, an offer by someone who has something to offer rather than a request to the potential recipient (Schegloff, 2007). The example of a pre-request which

creates an offer rather than a request is written below:

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  
 5 whether I've read it all or not.  
 6 Beth: I Believe in Miracles.  
 7 Abby: Yes,  
 8 Beth: And uh [I (have)-  
 9 Abby: F<sub>pre</sub> -> [You have it you say?  
 10 Beth: Uh I Believe in Miracles  
 11 Abby: F<sub>pre</sub>-> I say do you have it?  
 12 Beth: S<sub>pre</sub>-> Yes.  
 13 Abby: no F-> Uh huh,  
 14 Beth: F<sub>b</sub> -> And I'll be glad to (.) let you have it (a  
 15 week'r two).  
 16 Abby: S<sub>b</sub> -> 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 has done in both lines. The token also indicates that Abby is referring to an offer in line 13. She finally obtains the offer in line 14 and line 15. Then, the offer gets an acceptance in line 16.

The next response of a pre-request is a go-ahead. If an offer is not accepted, a go-ahead which then leads to a request can be done. The example of go-ahead response to a pre-request is shown below.

1 Abby:F<sub>pre</sub>->And uhm (0.8) I want(ed) to ask too, do you still  
 2 have a copy of The Cro- ih Cross and the Switchblade?  
 3 Beth:S<sub>pre</sub>->Yeah.  
 4 Abby:F<sub>b</sub> ->May I read it again?  
 5 Beth:S<sub>b</sub> ->Yes, you sure may, I've got it on my bedside and  
 6 I intend to read it again myself, and I started it,  
 7 Abby: Uh huh,

8 Beth: But then in the meantime, you know, it's kind of a  
 9 book you have to kind of feel in the mood to read.  
 10 Abby: Yeh- well, I've just had kind of: an urge to read  
 11 [it again,=  
 12 Beth: [Yeah.  
 13 Abby: =so I thought if you still have it, [why uh  
 14 Beth: [Well,-  
 15 Beth: Yeah, I have it, [and I'll bring it-  
 16 Abby: [and will loan it to me,-  
 17 Beth: Uh huh, and I'll bring it over and letchu read it.  
 18 Abby: Okay::y,

The extract above indicates that a pre-request has been done in line 1 until line 2. It contains a go-ahead response instead of an offer in line 3. This response is then followed by a base sequence, a request by Abby as first pair part (FPP) in line 4 and a response by Beth as Second pair part (SPP) in line 5 until line 6.

### 2.3.4 Apology

Apology is an action of asking for forgiveness. An apology can be formulated in a number of ways, depending on the circumstances. Apologizing can be indicated by apology markers such as “excuse me”, “forgive me”, “sorry”, “I’m sorry”, “I’m terribly sorry”, “I beg your pardon” (Stenstrom, 1994). Meanwhile, 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 organization of apologies, he identifies four places where apologies can occur. In addition, Robinson (2004) says that an apology can be done as “an initial turn-constructive unit of a turn that accomplishes a different action” (p.296). The example of apology-prefaced question is as follows.

(Robinson, 2004, p.296)

1 MOM :       Wha' I'm concerned about us do I give  
 2               f:luids, 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 s[ay?<]  
 7 MOM :   [sh]e:'s eighteen  
 8 DOC :       Eightee:n

The apology which prefaces question/answer sequence begins in line 5 and ends in line 7. The apology is a preliminary action to another action which is asking for information. The doctor says an apology since mom might have provided the information before; therefore, the doctor would ask her to repeat the information. However, there is no response to the apology in line 6. Instead, the response is directly intended to an action being accomplished (answering the question in line 4 and line 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 significant point which differentiates it 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 a 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 a second pair part apology as a preface of an account is displayed as follows.

(Robinson, 2004, p.299)

1 LES :                     A:re you thinking (.) o:f coming(.) to thuh  
 2                             meeting 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 toget back  
 7 toni:ght, h.[h  
 8 LES : [Yes=  
 9 MYR : =And mommy's going 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 occurs in line 3.

The account is a response to the question in the previous lines which are created by the first pair part.

Third, an apology can also be done as a second pair part of certain adjacency pair organized actions, for example complaint (Robinson, 2004). The example of an apology (second pair part) as complaint is given below:

(Robinson, 2004, p.300)

1 GOR : Are you going' tonigh=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) Caught[t me in thuh ba[th  
 10 GOR: → [.thh (o(h)h(h)I'm s(h)orr(h)y  
 11 hee=.hu(.).hhh(uh/oh) well I sh'(ll) let  
 12 you get back to it, =h  
 13 (0.2)  
 14 GOR: .hhh Uh::m(.) (.th) (0.2) sh'llI expect  
 15 you about quartwe past ei:ght?  
 16 (0.7)  
 17 NOR: Ah:Ib-uh) (0.8) Yeah.



The apology is done in line 10 as a response to the complaint in line 7 and line 9. In this case, the apologizing action is primary but there is no relevant response to the apology itself since the complaint sequence usually ends after the apology is given.

### **2.3.5 Announcement**

According to Stenstrom (1994), announcement is present neutral information and is typically realized by a declarative utterance with a falling tone. Announcement also has pre-sequence like another action sequences. Announcement sequences are the ones in which the tellers convey news on their own initiative. Frequently, two sorts of second pair part (SPP) are relevant response types for announcements, reflecting two sorts of interactional issue in announcement sequences: the ones who register whether what has been informed was previously not known by the recipient; and the ones who receive the news, or assess it, whether in the terms where it was presented (Schegloff, 2007, p.37). Schegloff (2007) reveals that one important constraint on “telling” is that speakers should not tell recipients what they suppose the recipients already know.

Still according to Schegloff (2007), pre-announcements have certain functions, namely:

- (a) they serve as an alert to recipients that what is to follow is built to be a way of informing or telling of news;
- (b) they may offer a characterization or assessment of the news (good/bad news) or a pre-mention of the topic or topical domain of the news, thereby setting parameters for the recipient’s parsing and recognition;
- (c) they may give evidence of the recency of what is to be reported, as evidence of its newsworthiness;
- (d) they make the actual telling a contingent next step,

whether by formulating it as an offer or request to tell (“Y’wanna know who . . .”) or by making the recipient-design constraint actionable.

Similar with another pre-sequence discussed above, one central type of second pair part (SPP) is the go-ahead response. These response turns are fitted to the first pair part (FPP) to which they are responsive. One particularly common exchange has the second pair part which repeats the question word used in the pre-announcement turn (Schegloff, 2007, p.40). The example of a go-ahead response of second pair part of pre-announcement is written below:

- 1 Bee: =I wanniduh look aroun fuh some cards,  
 2 Ava: (Oh:.)/ (Right.)  
 3 Bee: Tch! I’ll get some advance birthday cards, hhm hmh!  
 4 (0.6)  
 5 Bee: `hhh A:n:d uh, (0.5) Me:h,  
 6 (0.2)  
 7 Bee: F<sub>b</sub>→ Oh Sibbie’s sistuh hadda ba:by bo:way.  
 8 Ava: Who?  
 9 Bee: Sibbie’s sister.  
 10 Ava: Oh really?  
 11 Bee: Myeah,  
 12 Ava: S<sub>b</sub>→ [ ° (That’s nice.)/[ ° (Sibbie’s sistuh.)  
 13 Bee: [She had it yestihday. Ten:: pou:nds.  
 14 Ava: ° Je:sus Christ.

The transcription above indicates that “Sibbie’s sister” is someone whom Ava knows. Ava is eventually able to recognize who is being talked about with no further identifying information, just a repeat in line 8 until line 12.

The second type response of pre-announcement is blocking. In the “blocking” response, the prospective recipient claims are already to know the news, for example, the utterance “I know” is used to express a blocking response. The example of blocking response of pre-announcement can be found below:

Schenkein II, 216

1 Fay: F<sub>pre</sub>→ Didju hear about thee, pottery and lead poisoning  
 2                    [(                    )  
 3 Lor: S<sub>pre</sub>→ [Yeah Ethie wz just telling us [(                    )  
 4 Fay:            [I read an article  
 5                    en I ca- in a the- I 'nno whether it was Newsweek  
 6                    'r Time 'r what . . .

The transcripion above describes a pre-announcement in line 1 then it is responded by Lor as the second pair part with a blocking response in line 3. Lor responds it with “Yeah Ethie wz just telling us”; this statement indicates that Lor would not know more about the information from Fay. Then, the conversation stops.

In summary, the writer chooses six classifications of action sequences by Schegloff (2007) to answer and analyze the research question. This theory presents knowledge that helps the writer identify and analyze the data. The writer combines the classification of identification action with first pair part to categorize the type of action sequences used by the host of *Mata Najwa* talk show. Meanwhile, the writer combines the classification of identification respond with second pair part to categorize the type of action sequences by the guest.

#### 2.4 Preferred and Dispreferred Responses

Levinson (1983) stated there was a relationship between the parts of a particular type of a pair that could be responsible for whether the response would be labeled preferred and dispreferred. According to Schegloff (2007), Preferred and dispreferred response is the reply of first pair part question about invitation. Preferred response refers to the acceptance action of the invitation and

dispreferred refers to the refusal of invitation. Preferred and dispreferred can be caused by many action. Preferred response tend to be short and straightforward while dispreferred response are normally marked in long and complex forms.

According to Schegloff (2007), there are two groups of features which can be used to recognize the preferred response, that is, simple and no delay. Further, Schegloff adds that preferred response are likely to be short and to the point, and not ordinarily treated as accountable. Preferred responses tend to be short and straightforward while dispreferred responses are normally marked in long and complex forms. Levinson (1983) similarly, stated that there are main categories of dispreferred marker: a) A significant delay before the second is uttered in the form of a pause, a space taker such as 'well.. 'or 'uh.. er' or the displacement of the second over a number of repair initiators of other sorts of embedding; b) Prefaces such as the following: 'uh.. er', well.. 'or 'hm'; token agreements before disagreements; apologies if relevant; hesitation, and qualifiers: I (don't) think that..

Yule presents the patterns associated with dispreferred response, that is:

<b><u>Dispreferred Response</u></b>	<b><u>Example</u></b>
Delay/ Hesitate	pause; er; em;ah
Preface	well; oh
Express doubt	I am not sure; I don't know
Token Yes	That's great; I'd love to
Apology	I'm sorry; what a pity
Mention obligation	I must do X; I'm expected in Y
Appeal for understanding	You see; You Know
Make it non-personal	Everybody else; out there

Give an account	too much work; no time left
Use imigators	really; mostly; sort of; kinda
Hedge the negative	I guess not; not possible

## 2.5 Review of Related Studies

In this part, the writer presents other researches that give inspiration to her study. The writer suggests three studies. The first study is a research entitled *An analysis on Sequences Organization (Offer and Request) in Indonesian Conversation* by Rahmawati (2007); the second one is *A Study on the Pre-Sequence and Politeness Strategies of Making Request in the Conversation between Transgenders to Their Guest* by Agnes Indah Swandayani (2011). and the third study is *Pre-sequence used by English Department students and their interlocutors in daily conversation* by Evangelina (2009). The writer gives a brief summary about each of those researches.

*An analysis on Sequences Organization (Offer and Request) in Indonesian Conversation* by Rahmawati (2007) focused on offer and request sequence among the English Department students of Airlangga University. In her thesis, she wanted to know the types offer and request equence occured in a indonesian conversation. She found phenomenon when the offer is indicated to be rejected people would reproduce the offer sequence into a request. She also found that in Indonesian language, request sequence do not depend on the response. Although they get blocking response they will keep to produce request sequence. There are some similarities between Rahmawati's and the writer's studies. In her research, the writer analyzes the type of sequence as Rahmawati's research. The differences

between the writer's and Rahmawati's studies are the writer's subject is conversations between the host and the guest in *Mata Najwa* talk show; in contrast, Mariana analyzed student of Airlangga University. In addition, Rahmawati's data have been taken from daily conversation, while the writer of this study has chosen television talk program, namely *Mata Najwa* for the data source; this program is already settled in a formal situation.

In *A Study on the Pre-Sequence and Politeness Strategies of Making Request in the Conversation between Transgenders to Their Guest*, Swandayani (2011) had analyzed about pre-sequences and politeness strategies used by transgender to their guests when they make requests. In the findings, she firstly found out that basically not all of the transgenders have applied the concept of pre-sequence when they express the requests to other. From 9 conversation, there are 5 conversations using pre-sequences and the other do not use it. The differences between Swandayani's and the writer's studies are the writer analyzes the action sequences in a talk show in formal situation, while Swandayani analyzes daily conversation in informal situation.

In *Pre-sequence used by English Department students and their interlocutors in daily conversation* by Evangelina (2009), the study focused on the pre-sequence are usually used before announcing, arranging, inviting, requesting and closing something in the conversations of three English Department students. In his thesis, he wanted to know whether there was any difference in using the pre-sequence between the students and two kinds of interlocutors when they were having conversation. For the findings, Evangelina found that all types of pre-

sequence were used by the student and their interlocutors, the intimates and the distant. Meanwhile, pre-announcement was used more frequently by the subjects and the distant interlocutors. There are some similarities between Evangelina's and the writer's studies. In his research, the writer analyzed sequence and pre-sequence as Evangelina's research. The difference between the writer's and Evangelina's studies is that the writer analyzes the action sequences in a talk show, while Kusuma analyzes sequences in daily conversation.