

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

People are social beings besides being individuals. People need to interact and communicate with one another. It means that people cannot live alone. So, people use language to communicate. In short, human beings and language cannot be separated. Language is a fundamental instrument of the communication. Moreover, Kramsch (1983, p.3) said that language is the principal means whereby we conduct our social lives. According to Goffman (1999, p.6-10), people have so many ways to interact and communicate with others. People can communicate verbally and non-verbally. To communicate verbally, people use words or languages in sending information. Then non-verbal communication or wordless message can be a signals, symbols, and body languages such as eye contact, facial expression etc. Another function of a language is to share feelings with other people. In daily activities, people usually use at least one language to express their ideas through a communication process with others.

There are a lot of languages that can be used to express ideas, but the most important thing is people can understand each other by using the language. The language which is used must be appropriate to the social link, where people communicate each other and with whom people communicate with.

As a part of society, students of Airlangga University, especially students in English Department communicate with each other in everyday life. The writer

notices that most of the students use verbal communication through their meetings in campus everyday. When students meet one another, especially in informal context, English department students talk and chat about many things, for instance, hobbies, schools, friends, and other topics. In this case, the students, whose conversation taken for the data, have close relation with each other. Thus, it makes the conversation more comfortable and the participants can talk about whatever they want and they can also use many kinds of languages, such as Javanese, Javanese and English, as long as the other participants can comprehend the conversation.

When a person says “*hello*” to someone and gets a reply from another person, it can be said that they have done a conversation. In addition, when people chat for an hour or more, they have done conversation too. Conversation itself, according to Sacks (in Levinson, 1983), is a string of at least two turns that is opening and closing sequence. Based on this definition, the writer finds that most of the students at English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University do conversation every day.

In face-to-face interaction, conversation often happens among the students and it is possible that they will produce “invitation”, “offer” and “request” in their conversation. According to Jakobson’s and Hymes, there are four micro functions that can happen in “offers” feature: offer for action, offer for information, offer for help and offer for sympathy. All of those functions have their own purpose in conversation and they depend on the context of utterance.

Offer is an action in which a speaker proposes something to other speaker in conversation. Offers are similar to other sequences in which they have pre-sequence 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 their offers will be accepted or not and that the offers will depend on the response of the pre-offers (Schegloff, 2007).

To study the sequential organization in human utterances, discourse analysis mainly involves employing methodological and theoretical rules, while conversation analysis moves directly from empirical data to theoretical conclusion, without making any intervening assumptions (Levinson, 1983). In other words, conversation analysis adopts a bottom-up inductive research method compared to the top-down; deductive procedures were typical of discourse analysis. Conversation analysis takes a close look at unplanned, spontaneous and interactive conversation, and thereby provides a large database for investigation the organization of conversation.

It is important to note, however, that the concept of "conversation analysis" goes far beyond what its name suggested. It is applied not only to everyday conversation, but also to other forms of interactive talk. Deborah (2001) briefly listed some areas which fall into the scope of conversation analysis such as "talk in professional and workplace settings", "political speeches" and "radio phone-in programmes" (p. 89). Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, and Olsher (2002) also included some non-linguistic items like body language and facial expression into the field of conversation analysis.

From the definition that the writer has mentioned above, in this study the writer does not want to compare the differences between the sequence organizations only in general, but the writer wants to deeply investigate the conversation among the participants by comparing the structural organization of producing the sequences when the participants do an informal conversation. The writer wants to analyze the “invitation”, “offer” and “request” sequences in Javanese language and English. In this research, the writer wants to examine the sequences in Javanese language which used by the students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University and compare with the sequences in English whether there are any differences and similarities between the sequences.

1. 2. Statements of the Problems

In order to know whether there are some similarities and differences of sequence organization of talk in the mother tongue with the one in English, the writer formulates a set of research questions as follows:

1. How can “Invitation” sequences, “Offer” sequences and “Request” sequences occur in the Javanese conversation done by students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University?
2. What are the significant similarities and differences between the sequences of organization of talk used by students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University and the sequences of organization of talk in English?

I.3. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the Study are as follows:

- 1. To reveal the ways of producing conversation features sequences that was used by students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University while doing an informal conversation in Javanese language.**
- 2. To find the significant similarities and differences between the sequences of organization of talk used by students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University and the sequences of organization of talk in English.**

I.4. Significance of the Study

This study is aimed to find out the conversational features, in this case “Invitation” sequences, “Offer” sequences and “Request” sequences used by students in English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University and investigate whether there are any choices in the ways of producing those three sequences in the informal conversation situation. Through this study, the writer wants to compare the ways “Invitation” sequences, “Offer” sequences and “Request” sequences are used in Javanese language and English language. By looking at the way of producing the structural organization of sequences in informal conversation, this may lead the writer to find the answer whether there are any similarities and differences in the sequences structure between Javanese speakers and native English speakers. The writer hopes from the suggestions provided, the second language teachers could be more aware about the sequence

organization and would incorporate the result in their teaching, and second language learners can learn English more easily. On the other hand, the English Department students can do further analysis related to this study. This study is also expected to give contribution in CA field by giving useful information and knowledge about how the organization of sequences operates in informal situation.

I.5. Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding, the writer defines the following key terms:

a. Conversation

Conversation is not a structural product in the same way that a sentence is – it is rather the outcome of two or more independent, goal-directed individuals, with often divergent interest (Levinson, 1983).

b. Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis sometimes regarded as distinct from discourse analysis (Levinson 1983; 286), is a branch of study which sets out to discover what order there might be in this apparent chaos. Conversation analysis is an approach to the study of natural conversation, especially with a view to determining the following:

- Participants' methods of
 - a. Turn-taking
 - b. Constructing sequences of utterances across turns
 - c. Identifying and repairing problems, and

d. Employing gaze and movement

- How conversation works in different conventional settings

c. Offer Sequence

Offer is an action in which a speaker proposes something to other speaker in conversation. In this context, the first speaker sends an offer message to the second speaker in order to help or showing attention and caring.

d. Invitation Sequence

Invitation is an action which a speaker asks to somebody to come or go somewhere or ask someone to do something, to ask for something or say that something would be welcome.

e. Request Sequence

Request is an action which a speaker ask to somebody to do something, to ask formally or courteously for something to be given or done.

f. Adjacency Pairs

One basic unit of sequence construction is the adjacency pair d (Schegloff, 1991 & Sacks, 1973). Much of talk is based on adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are composed of a pair of turns that are related to each other in following ways. The first part of the adjacency pair, such as a question, initiates an action. The second pair part, such as the answer, responds to the invitation. The pair parts come in a predictable order; for example, in the first pair part, the question precedes the second pair part, the answer. Some examples of common adjacency pairs are:

- *Question-answer*
- *Greeting-greeting*
- *Invitation-acceptance/rejection.*

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE