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Abstract

This study aims at examining request sequences in Javanese conversation used by students in English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University. Using the theory of Schegloff (2007) about Conversation Analysis, the writer wants to see the characteristics of request sequences which are used in Javanese conversation. The writer finds that Javanese requests do not completely agree with English requests proposed by Schegloff (1995). This study is expected to give meaningful contribution in linguistic studies, especially conversation analysis which concerns with the pattern or structure of request sequences in Javanese conversation. This study is also viewed as cross-cultural study (Sidnell, 2009). As well as English requests proposed by Schegloff, Javanese requests also have sequence orders. Moreover preferred responses in Javanese requests are short and to the point. However, the occurrences of requests in Javanese conversations are more often done without pre-request. It also can be inferred from this research that the requests and responses are usually in direct forms in Javanese language.

Keywords: analysis, request sequences, sequence organization

Introduction

Conversation Analysis (CA) is known as the sociological approach in analyzing ‘talk-in-interaction’ in the studies of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Schegloff found some patterns in the sequence of conversation that naturally occurs among the speakers. When people want to ask or request something they give other statements first instead of saying it directly. This phenomenon is called as pre-request sequences, since they want to hear the respond first. According to Schegloff (2007), there are four types of responses toward pre-request sequences, offering, ‘go ahead’ response, ‘blocking’ response, and ‘hedging’ response.

People use pre-requests to try and get an offer rather than having to make a request. If they do not get an offer, then the response to a pre-request helps them decide whether or not their request will be granted. The most favorable response to a pre-request is an offer. The next preferred response is a go-ahead response (the speaker indicates that there is a possibility that the request will be granted). However request sequences itself also has both preferred and dispreferred response.

For example, if a speaker gets a go-ahead response, he can make the request knowing that there is a possibility that the request will be granted. If the response is a hedging response the other speaker can avoid making the request or continue and make request. If the response is a blocking response, the other speaker can avoid making the request.

Based on the phenomenon, the writer wants to conduct a research about request sequences that occurs among English Department students in which Javanese language is used as their daily language. According to the observation, request sequences are frequently uttered by English Department students. Since in the previous research Conversation Analysis study were only conducted in English and Indonesian language. Besides, Javaneselanguage became one of the widely used languages in Javanese community, especially Surabaya city, as a result this language is also important to be studied more deeply by the writer. Hence, it leads the writer to get a deeper research about how the characteristics of request sequences emerges in Javanese conversation, whether it
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This study is expected to give meaningful contribution in linguistic studies, especially conversation analysis which concerns with the pattern or structure of using languages especially on organization of request sequences in Javanese conversation. This study can enrich cross-cultural study, because CA also focuses on generic interactional problems which find solution in the local resources of particular languages (Sidnell, 2009). Moreover, this study is also expected to make an understanding of how people interact together when they are talking, so they will aware of the aspect of talk-interaction. Besides, they will avoid misunderstanding when they communicate with each other. In addition, the data can be helpful for other students who want to conduct research in Conversation Analysis (CA) field.

Method of the study

The analysis of this study will draw on the methodological approach of CA to analyze the sequential organization of requests. CA focuses on the procedural analysis of talk-in-interaction, how participants systematically organize their interactions to solve a range of organizational problems, such as the distribution of turns at talking, the collaborative production of particular actions, or problems of understanding. The analysis is always based on audio recordings of interaction, which are carefully transcribed in detail. The research should be "data-driven"—in the sense that concepts and hypotheses should be based on careful consideration of the data, recordings and transcript, rather than drawn from theoretical preconceptions or ideological preferences (Robin Wooffitt, 2005).

CA researchers insist on the use of audio recordings of episodes of 'naturally occurring', interaction as their basic data. A taped record enables repeated and detailed particular events in interaction and it also enhances the precision of the observations that can be made. It minimizes the influence of individual preconception. (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, p. 4)

In the beginning, the writer observed and recorded the Javanese conversation of English Department students. Then, the writer classified the request sequences according to Schegloff. The third, the writer transcribed the conversation data using CA transcription from Gail Jefferson (1984). Since transcription is very important in CA research, the conversation data must be in detail transcription. The forth, the writer identified and classified the data based on theory proposed by Schegloff about sequences organization (request sequences). The writer makes some tables to separate them into classification, in order to find out which sequences are included in pre-request sequences, request sequences, and responses. And last, the writer interpreted the data based on Schegloff’s theory.

Gumperz (1982) stated that while speech activities exist in all cultures, there might be differences in the ways particular activities are carried out and signaled (p. 166). It also agrees with Sidnell statement that CA is an approach to the study of social interaction that focuses on practices of speaking that recur across a range of contexts and settings. The early studies in this tradition were based on the analysis of English conversation. More recently, conversation analysts have begun to study talk in a broader range of communities around the world (Sidnell, 2009). In his previous research, Sidnell also examines social interaction across a wide range of languages including Finnish, Japanese, Tzeltal Mayan, Russian and Mandarin. The research demonstrates how the structure of talk is inflected by the local circumstances within which it operates. So, the study of CA can also enrich cross-cultural study, since CA focuses on generic interactional problems which find solutions in the local resources of particular languages and social systems. (Sidnell, 2009, p. 8)

In this study the writer conducts a research about Javanese language. Javanese language became widely used language in Surabaya city. Javanese language in Surabaya is also known as a language which is straight to the point, straightforward, and lack of formality (Santoso, 2007).

Population and sample

The data of this study is the transcript from the interaction recorded in the conversation between friends in Faculty of Humanities of Airlangga University. It was taken in December 2012. The population of this study is the English Department students in the class of 2009. In the conversation comes in sequences and the completion of sequences as English conversation based on Schegloff’s research (1995).
among English Department students of Airlangga University, they also use Indonesian language indeed. However, they are more frequently use Javanese language among friends. In this case the writer sort out their conversation further. The writer only collect data that actually uses the Javanese language.

**Participants**

The participants of this study are the English Department students in faculty of Humanities, Airlangga University. This research involves around 20 people. The conversation occurred between two students or in group. The participants have social background from Java; most of them come from Surabaya city and surrounding area. The students in this research are accustomed to using Javanese language in their daily life. The writer lets the data occur naturally by recording the writer’s friends because it can emphasize that the conversation is naturally occurring between friends. The writer does not distinguish between male and female conversation, because in CA research there is no comparison between men and women conversation. It takes only the difference between linguistic structure itself.

**Setting**

The conversation occurred when the students were waiting for a class, in a break time, or when the students were leaving a class. The writer took English Department students based on some considerations. The first consideration is because of CA research requires natural conversation. It can occur in conversation among friends. Besides, the participants are the writer’s surrounding. So, it will not be difficult to recognize that English Department students use Javanese language as their daily language.

**Request sequences**

Request is an action which a speaker asks to somebody to do something, or which a speaker asks formally or courteously for something to be given or done. (Schegloff, 1995). As in the previous explanation, in request sequences, there is also pre-sequence, which is considered as pre-request sequences. It also has both preferred and dispreferred SPP. Below are the request sequences proposed by Schegloff (1995).

**Type 1**

**Pre-request gets an offer**

SBL 2,2,4

1 Bet: And uhm I have her book
2 (1.0)
3 Bet: Have you read it?
4 Abb: 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 Abb: Yes,
8 Bet: And uh {I (have)-
9 → Abb: You have it you say?
10 Bet: Uh I Believe in Miracles
11 → Abb: I say do you have it?
12 Bet: Yes.
13 → Abb: Uh huh,
14 → Bet: And I’ll be glad to (.) let you have it (a week’r two).
15 → Abb: Yes I’d like to.

It seems that Beth utters a pre-offer as shown in lines 1-3. Abby initially does not pay attention on what Beth has said. But then, Abby makes a confirmation by using a pre-request as in lines 9 and 11. He asks whether Beth has the book or not in order to convince himself. Beth replies with a go-ahead
response by saying that she has the book asked. Abby can continue to make a request but he just responds “uh huh”, meaning that it is an incomplete statement. Fortunately, Beth gives a quick response with her offer as in line 14. This response pre-empt Abby to do a request. Unsurprisingly, the offer is accepted. Since the preferred response to the pre-request is an offer that is to be requested (Schegloff, 2007).

Type 2
Request gets a preferred response
If an offer is not possible in a conversation, go ahead response is the next-preferred response, as in the following:

SBL 1,1,12
1 → Abb: 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 → Bet: Yeah.
4 → Abb: May I read it again?
5 → Bet: Yes, you sure may

It seems that in lines 1-2, Abby uses a pre-request to convince himself that Beth has the book questioned. Beth then gives a go-ahead response to Abby, meaning that Abby can continue his request sequences. In this case, Abby’s opportunity to get the preferred response from Beth is achieved as shown in line 5.

Type 3
Request disguised as an offer
(Schegloff, 1995, p. 79)

Lotte : Don't chu want me tih come dow:n getchu dihmorr'entak
2 yih dow:n dih the beauty parlor?
3 (0.3)
4 Emma : What fo:r I jis did my hair it looks like pruh- a perfessional.
(0.3)
7 Lotte : I mean uh: You wanna go'd the store er anything over
et the Market[Ba:sket] er an[ything]?
9 Emma : [.hmhhh ].thhh].hhil .1111 W'l HO(NEYJAH)
10 Lotte : [or ]Ri]chard's?
(0.2)
12 Emma : I've bou:ghtEVrythai:ng?
(0.9)
14 → Emma: If[you wa]nt ME TIH go 't the beaudy pahler ah wi:ll,
15 Lotte : [ “Oh:.’”]
(.
17 Lotte : W'l I jus thought maybe we g'd gover duh Richard's
fer lunch then after uh get muh hair fixed.
19 Emma : Awri:ght.
20 Lotte : Oka:y,

In lines 1-2 Lotte offers to take Emma to the hairdresser. Unfortunately Emma rejects the offer. And then Lotte changes her offer in lines 7-8 by offering to go to the store with Emma. However, in line 14, Emma exposes Lotte's attempt to make request as an offer by stating "If you want ME TIH go 't the beaudy pahler ah wi:ll,". This attempt to present a request as an offer provides evidence that requests are less preferred than offers.
Preffered and dispreferred response

Sequences are the vehicle for getting some activity accomplished, and that response to the first pair part which embodies or favors furthering or the accomplishment of the activity is the favored – or, as we shall term it, the preferred – second pair part.

Schegloff (2007) explain that in sequences organization in such a way that response such as acceptance, granting, agreement, etc are preffered and response such as rejection, declining, disagreement, are dispreferred (pp.60). For requests, the +response invites formulation as “granting” or “acceding” and the −response as “rejecting” or “denying.” For offers and invitations, “accept” seems more apt for the +response, and “decline” joins “reject” as an apt term for the −response.

The Results

In this part the writer tries to analyze the request sequences among the English Department of Airlangga University Students which were recorded in December 2012 and taken in students’ daily conversation outside classrooms. This analysis was based on Schegloff’s theory about conversation analysis (CA).

In analyzing the data, the writer tries to subcategorize the conversation sequences based on request sequences: pre-request, offer, go-ahead, hedging, blocking, request, and response (preferred and dispreferred). The records include conversations between friends. The research presented in this paper is based on a data of 8 conversations and 10 types of request sequences. The collected data were transcribed according to the transcription notation developed by Gail Jefferson (1984).

Request sequences in Javanese conversation

Conversation 1

4 → E: Nilan lo kongkon moto i lo ::: hapene kan anyar
5       kongkonen moto
6 → N: (0.3) ((silent))
7 → E: potonen bro!
8 → N: lapo;?
9 → E: foto
10 → N: ((smiling))
11 → E: la timbang hapemu gak enek isine foto yo fotono aku
12 → N: ((laughing))

The conversation occurs among three people namely E, K, and N when they are waiting for a class. E and N are close friends. The context is when N has just bought a new mobile phone and then E knows it.

In this conversation, E wants to try N’s phone camera by taking her own photograph. E actually wants to ask N to take her photograph using N’s new mobile phone. E directly asks N through K as shown in line 4. This attempt is made in order to draw N’s attention. However, N notices E’s proposal and gives E a dispreferred response since N says nothing but smiles as in line 6. Smiling means that she has no desire to take E’s photograph using her new mobile phone and she does not want any further discussion about her new mobile phone.

E keeps requesting by saying “potonen bro!” as shown in line 7. But, in this sequence, N has no desire to take E’s photograph by saying “lapo?”. It clearly means that N rejects E’s request. In this case, E has requested for several times. Although E gets dispreferred responses from N, E keeps requesting N to take photograph using N’s new mobile phone. This conversation does not agree with English conversation proposed by Schegloff that dispreferred responses are commonly accompanied by the accounts (as in “I got a lot of things to do”), excuses (as in “I’ve gotta leave in about five minutes”), disclaimers (as in “I don’t know”), and hedges (Schegloff, 2007, p. 65). N uses direct rejection in expressing her rejection. N rejects E’s requests explicitly without any further accounts, excuses, disclaimers, and hedges.

Conversation 2
This conversation occurs among four people when B is looking for a book. The problem is that she is confused where to find that book. A suggests B to find it in the library. But, B does not have the library card to borrow the books. Then B tries to firstly make a pre-request before making a request. B gives a statement “aku nggak duwe kartune lo” as in line 2. It clearly states that B actually wants A to lend her the card. Here, B tries to request using a pre-request statement.

However, A does not have the card as well. A actually knows that B is using a pre-request. A knows that C has the card. So, A suggests B to borrow C’s card. Unfortunately, C gives B a dispreferred response by rejecting to lend B her card. C says “gak oleh lek gak dewe”, which refers to the card. It means that the card can only be used by the owner of the card. It does not mean that C fully rejects B’s request. C gives an account that she rejects to lend B her card due to the rules.

This conversation agrees with Schegloff’s statement (2007) that a dispreferred response is attenuated to the vanishing point (p. 65). C does not mention that she rejects B’s request explicitly. Yet, C makes a statement that the card cannot be used by the other. Through this statement, it is obvious that B cannot borrow the card. However, it is one of strategies from C to avoid hurting B’s feelings. In this case, C does not want to hurt B’s feelings by rejecting her request directly.

Conversation 3 (first part of conversation)
1 Z: Nilan↑ nilan↑ sini ((laughing)) seng butuh sopo. He
2 kamu mau ngapain↑ nilan?
3 N: Agama↑
4 Z: Ha iyo agama orangnya gak onok kon↑ sopo seng gak
5 mangkel↑ Ini aku nunggu↑ Ini aku lagi nunggu↑. Mungkin
6 orangnya lagi jumatan ::
7 P: Solat↑
8 N: Yo gapopo yo ga masalah lo ((laughing))
9 → Z: Yowes tunggu bareng ya nilan ya ::
10→ N: Yo

The conversation consists of three people. Z is the one who gives a request. The context is that Z is waiting for a lecturer to take a test and the lecturer does not come yet.

N suddenly comes because she wants to take a test as well. Since Z has been waiting for a long time, Z calls N to move toward her and asks N to stay with her until the lecturer comes. In expressing her request, Z does not hesitate to say so without making a pre-request first because she has already known that N is also waiting for the lecturer’s coming. For that reason, Z considers that it is not necessary to use a pre-request. Hence, she says “Yowes tunggu bareng yo nilan yo” as in line 9. Luckily N has no any bustle and she immediately agrees to wait along with Z. In this case, Z gets a preferred response from N. As stated by Schegloff (2007), preferred responses are likely to be short and to the point (p. 65). This conversation agrees with that, in expressing her acceptance N uses short and to the point statement. Preferred response does not need a complicated statement.

Conversation 3 (second part of conversation)
14 Z: Sini nilan (0.2) sebelahnya patty biar gilap
This conversation is the continuation of the previous conversation. It occurs when Z knows that N has just bought a new mobile phone. Then Z tries to ask N to treat her some foods by using pre-request as shown in line 15. In line 16, N rejects Z’s request by directly saying "enggak". N says “enggak” because she does not want to treat Z. She does not want any further conversation.

However, Z keeps teasing N as shown in line 4. Unfortunately, N rejects her requests for a second time by using a delay. The type of delay used in this conversation is the silence. According to Schegloff (2007), there is a variety of dispreferred responses. One of them is delay. Delay occurs when someone pauses their turn through "pre-pausals" (e.g., "uh"), hedges (e.g., "I dunno") or other discourse markers (e.g., "Well"), with or without ensuing silence (Schegloff, 2007, p.68).

In this conversation, request sequence do not depend on the response. As we can see, although Z get a blocking response from N, Z keeps producing request to N. Z just simply persuades N in order to get N’s attention. Unfortunately, Z gets blocking response till the end of the conversation.

Conversation 4 (first part of conversation)

This conversation occurs when V is walking accross W. W suddenly remembers that V has an unpaid debt. In this case, W makes a pre-request statement to V without using the first greeting. He uses a pre-request as a form of allusions to V, in an attempt that V is willing to pay her debts. This attempt is done since W is probably afraid of V’s rejection. Thus, W uses a pre-request statement. In this conversation, V fortunately gives a positive response to W. V immediately realizes that she is still owing to W and firmly replies "Yo nduwe". As a result, V directly pays her debt in order to avoid W to be angrier to her.

In this conversation, W just simply uses pre-request without making a request, because V here directly grants her pre-request and let herself to make a paymnt right after she replies W’s pre-request with the statement “Yo nduwe”.

In short, Javanese conversation among English Department students of Airlangga University has its own characteristics of sequence order. They will stop requesting if they already get what they request. But they will keep producing request until the end of the conversation although they get blocking responses.

Conversation 4 (second part of conversation)
In the midst of girls’ conversation, F asks W whether or not she sells prepaid credit. Then, W asks F to save her number so that F can call W whenever F needs W to send credit. F does not agree to save W’s number. F firstly asks whether W has the same class with her or not so that F can directly pay the credit. Unfortunately, W does not have the same class with F. Then F replies “Ooo”, meaning that F does not have any desire to save her number. However, W persuades F to accumulate the credit. If it is more than IDR 50,000, then F can transfer it for payment. F refuses her suggestion.

In this conversation, request sequences occur for several times. As we can see that W conducts requests until the end of the conversation. Although the requests are rejected, W keeps trying to persuade F in order that the requests can be approved. Unfortunately, it does not happen until the end of the conversation. In the beginning, F uses the account as a means for rejecting W’s request as in line 23. Since F feels pressured by W’s requests, she no longer uses the account and turns it directly into the rejection.

Conversation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>W:</th>
<th>R:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>La Ratna ::::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hey ::::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ayo mbayar mbayar mbayar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Besok besok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ga bisa ga bisa besok iku libur ga bisa ga bisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>aduh :::: kenapa tadi dateng kesini ketemu winda ::::</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>kudu mbayar aku wes gak nduwe duwek↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>kena berapa se↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cuma 17 kan↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yo ((laughing))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lilik↑ lilik ayo totalan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lo kan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ayo totalan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Berapa↑?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(0.5) Biarin aku udah gak duwe duwek dari kemaren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conversation consists of two people. In this conversation, the request occurs without any pre-requests. This is because the speaker has already known that the interlocutor understand what she expects. Thus, this conversation does not need any pre-request sequences.

In the beginning of the conversation, W directly stating her request as in line 3 with the statement “Ayo mbayar mbayar mbayar”. At the first time W gets a dispreferred response from R because R rejects to pay that day. Instead, R proposes to make the payment the next day. W still insists R on paying the credit that day because the next day is holiday. R convinces W to make a payment next day. Unavoidably, R can no longer deny and W seems regret for unintentionally meeting W. R keeps dodging, but W insists on continuing her request to R. R finally gives up and pays the credit right then. This is because R avoids W to be angrier to her.

In this conversation, the request occurs for several times. It does not agree with English request proposed by Schegloff in proposing a request. In Javanese conversation among English Department
students of Airlangga University when the speaker request for something to other people and they get blocking responses toward pre-request sequences, they will keep continue to make request sequences.

Conversation 6
20 M: Aku nang pak deny↑
21 P: Aku lo apene nang bu nurul kok geer se kon↑
22 He aku kancanono duiluk po’o:::
23 M: Lo aku lo kate nang pak deny konsultasi↑
24 P: Yo mangan kan mari ngono
25 M: Iyo tapi koyoke konsultasine jek suwe deh:::
26 P: Ala::h yowes tak tinggal ae lek ngono↑

M and P are close friends. In this conversation, not feeling any hesitation, P asks M to accompany her to do something without using any pre-request. She does not care about the answer if it will be rejected or accepted. Although P gets rejection from M, P keeps trying to ask M as shown in line 5. P asks whether or not M will have lunch by expressing her requests to have lunch together. P actually wants to grant her request to have lunch together, but then M refuses. M refuses B by using an account as in line 6, “Iyo tapi koyoke konsultasine jek suwe deh”

At first, M explicitly rejects P’s request. When M rejects P’s request for a second time, she uses the reason why he rejects the request. This is because M supposes it necessary to explain to P why she rejects the request.

This conversation is not completely compatible with what is described by Schegloff in his theory that every dispreferred response is never articulated. The dispreferred response in Javanese language is directly to the point, unless it is considered necessary to give reasons.

Conversation 7
1 T: nek aku paling nggolek nang unesa;
2 → P: aku po’o aku po’o ajaken po’o :::::
3 → T: kapan pek?↑
4 P: la kon kapan lo :::: nang unesa
5 T: makane kapan yo nang unesa yo ::::
6 → Z: eh barengan yo aku ma winda juga mau kesana
7 → T: ayok ayok kapan↑

In this conversation, it seems that P does not firstly use any pre-request by immediately expressing that she also wants to join to go to UNESA library with T. T actually does not offer P to come along with her. T just says that she wants to look for a book in the library. Suddenly P asks T to join together. T gives P a hedging response as shown in line 3 because she is not sure yet when she will go there. Afterward Z comes and hears the conversation between T and P. Z is interested in joining them to go to the library. In this turn, T finally gives a preferred response to Z as in line 7.

Conversation 8
1 G: He he ris ris ris ris njaluk tulung po’o:::
2 Riz: Waduh↑
3 G: Fotokopikno po’o:::
4 Riz: males↑
5 G: Ik i lo sebelah iki loo
6 H: (0.2) yowes↑
7 G: Suwun yo, bro!
8 H: yo

This conversation involves two men. Both are busy with their activities. Riz suddenly walks through G and asks Riz to photocopy his files in photocopy center. Riz initially gives a negative response to G because he feels that he has no time for doing that. However, Riz finally agrees to help G photocopying G’s files because G urges Riz. In this conversation, when the speaker conducts the
request, it does not depend on the response. Although the speaker get blocking response at the first time, but he keep produce to make request.

**Interpretation of the results**

Conversation may be considered as a universal communication system. Due to that, the analysis of sequence in conversation is carried out in this research. Gumperz (1982) stated that while speech activities exist in all cultures, there might be differences in the ways particular activities are carried out and signaled (p. 166).

It often occurs in everyday communication that there is a misunderstanding among one another if a conversation is not in a sequence. Consequently, one of the benefits of studying conversation analysis is to avoid any misunderstanding among people since there are face threatening acts in language terms. FTAs (Face Threatening Acts) are the ‘acts and strategies which could harm or threaten the positive or negative face of one’s interlocutors’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

From the analysis above, the writer finds that the request sequences in Javanese conversation among the English Department students of Airlangga University have a sequence order as well as in English conversation. It has sequence order in which the pre-request occurs first, and then followed by the response, the request and so forth. They occur sequentially. Thus, it forms pairs.

However, not all conversation in Javanese conversation among the English Department students of Airlangga University uses a pre-request in conducting a request. The conversations are more often conducted without pre-request because of the intimacy among the communicators. As a result, there is no hesitation in requesting for something due to this intimate relationship (friendship). For this reason, a pre-request is rarely used in requests among English Department students. Depending on the association and the position of communicators, the conversation can be direct or indirect. Deena and Mara (1982, p. 21) stated, “There are limits to the degree of directness a person allowed to express, especially with people of higher status such as teacher and employers.”

After stating a request, the speaker generally waits for the response of the hearer. In the request sequence analysis, there are two main responses, namely preferred and dispreferred responses, with the categories previously explained by the writer in Chapter 2. In Javanese requests among English Department students of Airlangga University, the preferred responses are short and to the point. It agrees with English requests proposed by Schegloff that preferred responses are short and to the point.

However, the dispreferred responses occurring in Javanese requests among the English Department students do not agree with English requests proposed by Schegloff that a dispreferred response is never actually articulated; that it is attenuated to the vanishing point. Javanese requests conducted by English Department students of Airlangga University use a direct rejection statement in expressing dispreferred response. The dispreferred responses in Javanese conversation are rarely accompanied by the accounts (as in “I got a lot of things to do”), excuses (as in “I’ve gotta leave in about five minutes”), disclaimers (as in “I don’t know”), and hedges (as in “I don’t want make anything definite”). Javanese conversations are direct and to the point in expressing dispreferred response.

In request sequences proposed by Schegloff, the most preferrable response to answer a pre-request is an offer from the hearer. It is not applicable to Javanese conversation. Although the hearer has already known what the speaker wants, the hearer allows the speaker to make the request. Therefore, it does not support Schegloff statement that the most preferrable response to request is an offer. It is due to the characteristic of Surabaya dialect, that is outspoken and straightly to the point. It corresponds with Santoso’s statement in her research (2007) that Javanese language in Surabaya also known as a language which is straight to the point, straightforward, and lack of formality. Henry (1961) also affirmed that language is not only the product of culture, but also the symbol of culture (p.7). Larry, Richard, and Nemi (1981) stated that culture and communication are attached because culture does not only determine the participants, the issue, and the process of conversation but it also helps to clarify how people encode messages, the conditions and circumstances under which diverse messages may or may not be sent, noticed, or interpreted. In other words, culture is the groundwork of communication.
The writer also finds that when someone expresses pre-requests and requests and then they get a blocking response/dispreferred response, s/he will continue to re-try to request until s/he finally gets the clarifying reasons for refusal. Request sequences does not depend on the responses, whether it is preferred or dispreferred response. Thus, the speaker will keep producing request although they get dispreferred responses for several times. The speaker still insists the request until s/he gets an agreement even though it finally does not reach any agreement until the end of the conversation.

It can be inferred that the requests and responses are usually in direct forms in Javanese conversation among English Department students of Airlangga University. In asking a request, most of Javanese conversations simply express their thought as shown in the analysis above. They also answer the request in a direct manner, whether they reject or accept it. However, they will use statements such as mitigation, elaboration, or account as Schegloff stated unless if they suppose it helpful and necessary.

Javanese conversation among English Department students of Airlangga University employs more direct forms in conducting request sequences and in giving responses. This research agrees with Sidnell (2009), that it also demonstrates how the structure of talk is inflected by the local circumstances within which it operates.

Conclusion

People interact and communicate in their everyday life. Conversation may take the small form of talk for example like greeting, gossiping or doing other natural conversation. In doing conversation, people need to hear responses from the people they talk to. Such actions are inviting, offering, requesting, apologizing, or greetings.

Request is an action which a speaker asks to somebody to do something, or which a speaker asks formally or courteously for something to be given or done. (Schegloff, 1995). The writer uses Schegloff’s theory about conversation analysis to analyze the request sequences which happened among English Department students of Airlangga University whether it comes in sequences and the completion of sequences as English conversation based on Schegloff’s research.

Schegloff found some patterns in the sequence of conversation that naturally occurs among the speakers. When people want to ask or request something they give other statements first instead of saying it directly. This phenomenon is called as pre-request sequences, since they want to hear the respond first.

From the analysis above, the writer finds some characteristics of the request sequences in Javanese conversation among English Department students of Airlangga University. It has a sequence order, in which the pre-request occurs first, followed by the response, the request and so forth.

However, in case of pre-request sequences, the conversation in Javanese language is often conducted without any pre-request because of the intimacy among the communicators. It does not agree with English conversation proposed by Schegloff that people use pre-request to try and get an offer rather than having to make a request.

In Javanese requests among English Department students of Airlangga University, the preferred responses are short and to the point. It agrees with English requests proposed by Schegloff that preferred responses are short and to the point.

The dispreferred response occurring in Javanese conversation does not agree with Schegloff’s statement (2007) that a dispreferred response is never actually articulated; it is attenuated to the vanishing point (p. 65). The dispreferred responses in Javanese conversation are rarely accompanied by the accounts, excuses, disclaimers, and hedges. Javanese conversations are direct and to the point in expressing dispreferred response.

In request sequences proposed by Schegloff, the most preferrable response to answer a pre-request is an offer from the hearer. It is not applicable to Javanese conversation. Although the hearer has already known what the speaker wants, the hearer allows the speaker to make request. Therefore, it does not support Schegloff statement that the most preferrable response to request is an offer. It is due to the characteristic Surabaya dialect which is outspoken and straight to the point. The writer also
finds that when someone expresses a request and gets a dispreferred response, s/he will keep producing request although they get dispreferred responses for several times.

It can be inferred that the requests and responses are usually in direct forms in Javanese language. In asking a request, most Javanese people simply express their thought as shown in the analysis above. They also answer the request in a direct manner, whether they reject or accept it. However, they will use statements such as mitigation, elaboration, or account as Schegloff stated unless if they suppose it helpful and necessary.
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