

THE UNDERLYING PATTERNS OF CAFÉ TALK

Ninuk Krismanti
STKIP PGRI BANJARMASIN
ninukkrismanti@gmail.com

Abstract

Café talk represents casual conversation that is usually taken for granted by people. This study is intended to reveal patterns of exchange structures underlying café talk. To achieve the objective of the study, the writer applies Francis and Hunston's model of analysis (1992). Participatory observation is the technique used to collect the data. The method of analysis used in this study is referential method. Based on the analysis, it is found that there are 21 patterns constructing 1459 exchanges found in the data. Of the 1459 exchanges, 10 exchanges are found in organizational exchange category, and 1449 exchanges are found in conversational exchange category. Inform exchange, elicit exchange, and bound-elicited exchange from conversational exchange category are the most prominent exchanges found in the data.

Keywords: café talk, exchange, pattern

A. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

People do not only talk when they need something to get done for them (transactional motive); they also talk whenever they feel talking is necessary. People may talk to simply say hi to their neighbors. People may talk to share stories with their friends. People may talk for hours with someone who is sitting beside them on a bus. People talk to fulfill their interpersonal needs as parts of social creatures.

Most of the conversations we face starting from waking up in the morning to going to bed at night are in form of casual conversations. However, because of its commonness, most people do not realize

that there are many aspects that can be explored from this kind of conversation. Therefore, the writer is interested in conducting a study to analyze a casual conversation.

Café-talk is chosen as the data of this research because it represents informal talk which is usually taken for granted by its speaker. In this research, the writer tries to analyze patterns of exchange structures underlying café talk becoming the data. The café talk being investigated in this study is the one in which the writer, herself, becomes one of the participants.

1.2 Research Question

This research is aimed to answer the question of “what patterns are underlying the café talk being investigated?”

1.3 Objective of the Study

The objective of this research is to find out patterns underlying the café talk being investigated.

1.4 Scope

The writer realizes that there are tremendous aspects that can be explored from a casual conversation such as café talk, yet it is impossible to describe all of these aspects for the writer's limited time and capacity. Thus, this research is limited to the following scopes:

1. In terms of I – R pattern, even though the I – R pattern in this study has relationship with adjacency pair in turn-taking system, the I – R pattern in this study represents certain moves in certain exchanges outlined by the Francis and Hunston's model (1992).
2. In terms of participants, the participants becoming the focus of this study are limited to those who are involved in the café talk being recorded.
3. In terms of transcription, overlapping of utterances in the data is neglected since the study is not aimed to analyze overlapping of turns among participants.

1.5 Significances of the Study

This research is expected to:

1. Give information on patterns underlying casual conversation.
2. Provide information for other researchers who are interested in conducting research on casual conversation.

B. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

2.1 Review of Previous Studies

In this part of discussion, two studies related to the research are reviewed. The first study is entitled *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends* by Deborah Tannen (2005). In her study, there are three aspects that are analyzed by Tannen: (1) linguistics devices in conversational styles, (2) narrative strategies, and (3) irony and joking. To analyze these aspects, Tannen applies interactional sociolinguistics approach. Through her book, Tannen presents a model of interactional sociolinguistics analysis that is carried out under the influence of Lakoff's and Gumperz's works.

In relation to this study, both Tannen's study and this study are aimed to analyzed informal conversation among friends. However, Tannen applies interactional sociolinguistics approach while conversational analysis approach

using Francis and Hunston's model (1992) is the one applied in this study.

The second study is entitled *The Pattern of Classroom Interaction and the Distribution of Turn-Taking: A Study in Two Different Classes in Jambi* by Mukhlas Abrar (Post-Graduate Program of University of Diponegoro, 2013). The study by Abrar is aimed to reveal patterns of classroom interactions in two different classes as well as to identify turn-taking distributions in both classes.

In relation to this thesis research, the similarity between the study by Abrar and this study is that both studies are aimed to reveal patterns of interactions. On the other hand, both studies have two differences. First, Abrar applies Sinclair and Coulthard's model (1975) in his research while Francis and Hunston's model of analysis (1992) is the one applied in this research. The second difference is that Abrar only focuses his analysis on patterns in exchange rank while the analysis of this research focuses on two ranks: move and exchange.

2.2 Theoretical Concept

2.2.1 Spoken Discourse

Spoken discourse is highly associated with three terminologies: conversation, talk, and discourse. According to Cameron (2001:9), 'conversation' does not always refer to

spoken language even though it usually refers to it. In her example, she mentioned about 'chatting' via internet that is commonly taken as 'conversation' even though the interaction is done through written language form. This case is different from 'talk' which can only refer to the spoken form of language. Furthermore, in terms of usage, 'conversation' and 'talk' have different senses that are understood by English speakers. Generally, both can substitute each other, but at particular settings, they cannot. 'Discourse', according to Cameron (2001:10), is a more generic term that can refer to any language form in any setting.

2.2.2 Conversation Analysis (CA)

The first development of conversation analysis was initiated by the work of Sacks followed by Schegloff and Jefferson over 40 years ago. CA offers an understanding of interaction in a structural view. Schiffrin (1994:232) stated, "CA differs from other branches of sociology because rather than analyzing social order *per se*, it seeks to discover the methods by which members of a society produce a sense of social order." From this statement, it can be inferred that conversations produced by the society members are formed through certain methods or organizations, and these methods or organizations are what CA is

trying to reveal. In addition to this, Tolson (2006:26) concluded that structures becoming focus of CA lay on three insights: adjacency, turn-taking, and sequence.

Since its first introduction, CA has been developed greatly in different directions. There are various models of analysis developed by conversationalists in respect to CA. In 1975, Sinclair and Coulthard proposed a model of analysis for the purpose of classroom discourse understanding. The signature of this model is the use of scale rank to help the description. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1992: 3-5), there are five ranks in which a classroom discourse is composed: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. In 1992, two professors from National University of Singapore, Gill Francis and Susan Hunston, modified Sinclair and Coulthard's model to fit not only classroom setting but also other discourse situations. For the purpose of this research, the later model is used as the basis of analysis.

2.2.3 Francis and Hunston's Model of Analysis

Similar to Sinclair and Coulthard's model (1975), Francis and Hunston's model (1992) also consists of five ranks: interaction, transaction, exchange, move, and act. The replacement of 'lesson' in

Sinclair and Coulthard's model (1975) to 'interaction' in this categorization shows that Francis and Hunston's model (1992) is more flexible in terms of application because it is not limited to classroom interaction only.

A more detailed explanation of acts, moves, and exchanges in Francis and Hunston's model (1992) is as the following:

2.2.3.1 Acts

Sinclair and Coulthard (1992:8) defined act as the lowest rank of discourse patterning. According to them, there are three acts that almost always appear in any spoken discourse. They are (1) elicitation (which in Francis and Hunston's model (1992) are divided into three different acts: inquire, neutral proposal, and marked proposal), (2) directive, and (3) informative. Francis and Hunston (1992:128-133) proposed 33 acts of everyday conversation including greeting, summons, confirm, reject, and other acts.

2.2.3.2 Moves

A series of acts creates moves. Francis and Hunston (1992: 134-136) divide moves into eight categories: (1) framing, (2) opening, (3) answering, (4) eliciting, (5) informing, (6) acknowledging, (7) directing, and (8) behaving.

2.2.3.3 Exchanges

A series of moves creates a higher rank, exchange. According to Francis and Hunston (1992:136), there are two classes of exchange. The first one is organizational exchange, and the second one is conversational exchange. Organizational exchange has two subclasses: boundary exchange and structuring exchange. Structuring exchange consists of three different exchanges. They are structuring, greet, and summon. These three structuring exchanges are realized through two compulsory elements of structure: initiation (I) and response (R). Conversational exchange consists of four exchanges: elicit, inform, direct, and bound-elicited (which consists of clarify, repeat, and re-initiation exchanges). The structure of all conversational exchanges, except direct exchange, is I (R/I) R (Fⁿ). (I) and (R) are compulsory elements of structure while (R/I) and F (follow-up/feedback) are optional for all conversational exchanges.

C. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design

This research is descriptive research carried out under qualitative approach. Heigham and Croker (2009:9) state, "Qualitative research mostly focuses on understanding the particular and the

distinctive phenomena and does not necessarily seek or claim to generalize findings to other contexts." This statement is in accordance with the purpose of this research. This research is not intended to make generalization of patterns underlying casual conversation. The aim of the study is to analyze discourse phenomena occurring within the conversation being investigated itself without seeing other conversations in other contexts.

3.2 Data and Data Collecting Procedure

The data of this study are recorded from a 1:59:49 long conversation among friends taking place in a café. To collect the data, the writer applies participatory observation technique. In the café talk becoming the data, the researcher is actively involved as one of the participants. The involvement of the researcher in the conversation is natural because all participants in this conversation are researcher's friends. With this direct involvement, the conversation will run less awkwardly, and behavior changes of participants due to recording process can be mitigated.

3.3 Method of Analysis

The method of analysis used in this research is referential method. According to Sudaryanto (1993:13), referential method is the method of analysis that uses

referents (what are being talked) as its basis of analysis. To categorize utterances found in the data, supra segmental units such as tone, intonation, and other units are used along with contextual meanings as the basis to determine which moves and exchanges these utterances are belong to.

The analysis is done by applying Francis and Hunston's model of analysis (1992). This model suggests five hierarchical elements of conversation namely act, move, exchange, transaction, and interaction. However, only the elements of move and exchange that will be used in the analysis. The main reason of doing so is because only the two have explainable internal structures for describing the patterns of the café talk being analyzed. The rank of act is occasionally explained when needed to support the explanation of move. The rest two ranks, transaction and interaction, have no clear structural representations so that they are neglected in this study.

3.4 Accountability in Transcription

The transcriptions of data in this study are in forms of orthographic transcriptions. The transcriptions are re-checked by repeating the recording more than one time to make them accountable. The writer directly confirms to the related participants in case there are parts of the conversation which are difficult to

transcribe due to the quality of the recording.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this study, there are 1459 exchanges found during 1:59:49 long conversation being recorded. Of the 1459 exchanges, 10 exchanges are found in organizational exchange category, and 1449 exchanges are found in conversational exchange category. Inform exchange, elicit exchange, and bound-elicited clarify exchange from conversational exchange category are the most prominent exchanges found in the data.

4.1.1 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Boundary Exchange

There is only one boundary exchange found in the data. This exchange is realized by a framing move at Fr. The excerpt below shows that exchange:

Excerpt 1: Fr Pattern in Boundary

Line of dialogue

Ninuk : Oh my gosh! (high key)
 Tina : *Waeyo?*
 What's the matter?
 Ninuk : *Undul pake jeans*
 Undul is putting on jeans
 Tina : *Iyaaa... perkenalan jeans baru*
 Yes... (he) is introducing (his)
 new jeans

The excerpt above shows that the only boundary exchange found in the data is remarked by a high key '*Oh my gosh!*' uttered by Ninuk. The high key in this utterance is aimed to catch other participants' attention. This line of dialogue is served as a frame to lead at least one of the participants to get into another move in a new exchange. It is a boundary set by Ninuk to provoke her opponents to respond her frame. As shown in the excerpt, Tina is the one who took the turn after Ninuk. Tina responded Ninuk's utterance through an eliciting move '*waeyo*' which means 'what's the matter' in a new elicit exchange. The response '*waeyo*' indicates two things. First, it indicates Tina's understanding on Ninuk's intention to make another participant utter a new exchange as the response to her frame. Second, it indicates Tina's assumption that Ninuk understands the word *waeyo* which is a Korean word so that she could expect Ninuk to take the

Exchange

move	exchange structure	exchange structure
framing	Fr	boundary
eliciting	I	elicit
informing	R	
acknowledging	R	

turn after her in order to answer her elicitation.

4.1.2 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Structuring Exchange

There are only two exchanges found in structuring exchange category. The two exchanges are constructed by two patterns: I-R and I-Rⁿ. An example of one of the patterns found is given in the excerpt 2 below:

Excerpt 2: I-R Pattern in Structuring Exchange

Line of dialogue	move	exchange structure	exchange structure
Tio : <i>Volumenya udah tak semua udah tak kecilin</i> I have turned the volume down	informing	I	inform
Tina : <i>Astagfirullah</i> I seek forgiveness from Allah	acknowledging	R	
Ninuk : <i>Yo wes... Itadakimasu minnasama</i> That's it then... let's eat everyone	opening	I	structuring
Parts : \emptyset (Participants start eating the snacks they ordered)	answering	R	

In the data, there is only one exchange in structuring category constructed by I-R pattern. The last two lines in excerpt 2 above shows that pattern. Ninuk's line is considered as an opening move in a structuring exchange because by uttering the line, she structured a new episode of the conversation. Before Ninuk uttered the line, participants took pictures and talked about why the mobile phone camera used to take the pictures had no sound. After Ninuk uttered the line, the episode of taking picture and talking about its sound stopped, and the participants started enjoying the snacks they ordered. The silence \emptyset occurring after Ninuk's utterance is considered as the response showing participants' failure to protest Ninuk. This silence indicates participants' agreement to enjoy their snacks. In terms

of act, Francis and Hunston (1992:129) categorize silence \emptyset as acquiesce (acq) act which is served as default mechanism that indicates acquiescence. Acquiesce act is functioned to fill a position of compulsory answer for an initiation in structuring exchange category when there are no other acts fill this position.

4.1.3 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Greet Exchange

Among all exchanges found in the organizational exchange category, greet exchange contributes half the number of total organizational exchanges found. There are six greet exchanges of 12 exchanges falling into this category. These six exchanges are formed by two patterns: I-R and I-Rⁿ. Five exchanges are constructed by I-R pattern, and one exchange is constructed by I-Rⁿ pattern.

Excerpt 3 below shows an example of exchanges found in greet exchange

category:

Excerpt 3: I-R Pattern in Greet Exchange

Line of dialogue	move	exchange structure	exchange
Rezqan : <i>Halo, mbak... aih udah lama gak ketemu.</i> Hallo, <i>mbak...</i> it's been a long time	opening	I	greet
Sari : <i>Halo, apa kabar?</i> Hallo, how are (you)?	answering	R	

From the excerpt above, we can clearly distinguish the I-R pattern in which the initiation (I) is uttered by Rezqan and the response (R) is uttered by Sari. To respond Rezqan's greeting, Sari used the expression of *halo, apa kabar?* which means 'hallo, how are you?'. Sari's response is an example of how a question is not merely functioned to elicit information. In the excerpt above, Sari's question '*halo, apa kabar?*' is not aimed to find any information about Rezqan's condition, but rather it is served as phatic response for Rezqan's greeting. Rezqan understood this phatic function of Sari's utterance so that he gave no further response to it. Rezqan's decision not to

give further response to Sari's turn is normal because Sari's phatic line, as phatic 'you're welcome' to respond 'thank you', does not oblige any response. This shows that in a complete exchange, I element should be responded by R, but the response to R is optional. It needs to be remembered that R is not always necessarily has phatic function in it even though the example given in the excerpt above is the one with pathic function.

4.1.4 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Summon Exchange

There is only one summon exchange found in the data. This only exchange is constructed by I-R pattern as shown in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 4: I-R Pattern in Summon Exchange

Line of dialogue	move	exchange structure	exchange
Tio : <i>Mas...</i> (<i>Mas</i> is the term used to address a man)	opening	I	summon
Waiter : \emptyset	answering	R	
Tio : <i>Air putih ada gak, Mas?</i> Do you have water, <i>Mas</i> ?	eliciting	I	elicit

From the dialogue above, it can be seen that Tio's summons is answered by silence from the waiter. However, the fact that the waiter came after Tio uttered the summons proved that the waiter listened to what Tio said. Because Tio knew he got the waiter's attention, he created a new utterance in an elicit exchange to deliver his intention of calling the waiter. Thus, it can be concluded that the answer of summons is not necessarily given in form of verbal response. Non-verbal response followed by action as shown by the waiter above is one of the alternative ways of answering someone's summons.

4.1.5 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Inform Exchange

Among 1459 exchanges found in the data, 625 exchanges are found in inform exchange category. It means that 42.8% of all exchanges found are found in this category. Thus, it is not surprising that inform category of exchange has more various patterns compared to other exchange categories. Among 21 patterns

found, 17 patterns are found to construct exchanges in this category. These 17 patterns are (1) I, (2) I-R, (3) I-Rⁿ, (4) I-R-F, (5) I-R-Fⁿ, (6) I-R-F-R, (7) I-R-F-R-F, (8) I-R-R/I-Rⁿ, (9) I-Rⁿ-F, (10) I-Rⁿ-Fⁿ, (11) I-Rⁿ-F-R, (12) I-Rⁿ-F-Rⁿ, (13) I-Rⁿ-Fⁿ-R, (14) I-Rⁿ-R/I-R, (15) I-R/I-R, (16) I-R/I-Rⁿ, and (17) I-R/I-Rⁿ-F.

The most prominent patterns in inform exchange are I which constructs 224 exchanges, I-R which constructs 149 exchanges, and I-Rⁿ which constructs 189 exchanges. Moreover, there are three patterns which are only found in the category of inform exchange. These three patterns are I-R-Fⁿ, I-Rⁿ-Fⁿ, and I-Rⁿ-R/I-R.

The excerpt below is an example of one of the three patterns that is only found in inform exchange category:

Excerpt 5: I-Rⁿ-R/I-R Pattern in Inform Exchange

Line of dialogue

- Sari : *Coffee Toffee di sini udah ada di situ ya? Di dekat situ ya?*
Coffee Toffee here is located right there, isn't it? Near that way, right?
- Ninuk : *Coffee Toffee ada.. ada di... Tembalang*
Coffee Toffee is... is in... Tembalang
- Sari : *Di Tembalang, sama di sini (low key)*
In Tembalang, and there is also one over here (low key)
- Ninuk : *Di sini ada? Tapi aku gak suka Coffee Toffee*
There is one here? I don't like Coffee Toffee though
- Sari : *Gak suka ya?*
(You) don't like it, do (you)?

There is only one exchange constructed by I-Rⁿ-R/I-R pattern as shown in the excerpt. In the excerpt above, Ninuk was mistaken Sari's information to be an elicitation. Thus, instead of receiving or rejecting Sari's information 'Coffee Toffee di sini udah ada di situ ya? Di dekat situ ya?' through an acknowledge move, Ninuk gave new information about the location of Coffee Toffee through an informing move. This response by Ninuk was then followed by an acknowledgment

by Sari who received Ninuk's point that there was a Coffee Toffee café located in Tembalang. Moreover, Sari also reformulated her previous utterance by saying that there was also another Coffee Toffee café located near where they were at that time. This utterance made it clear for Ninuk that Sari's I was information instead of an elicitation. Ninuk then responded Sari's acknowledgment by uttering 'Di sini ada? Tapi aku gak suka Coffee Toffee' meaning 'there is one here? I don't like Coffee Toffee though' at R/I in the informing move. This utterance is considered to have R/I element of structure because it has both predicted and unpredicted element. 'Di sini ada?' is the predicted element since it is still related to the previous line uttered by Sari. 'Tapi aku gak suka Coffee Toffee' is unpredicted element since it brings new information that is not predicted by the previous utterance. R/I element of structure is always followed by R and cannot be used to close an exchange. In the excerpt above, Ninuk's I/R was followed by Sari's R in the acknowledging move. Because Sari's R was served as an acknowledgement, it was not compulsory for Ninuk to respond to this utterance even though Sari's line 'gak suka ya?', meaning 'you don't like it, do you?', was uttered in form of a question. Excerpt 13 above shows another example

of how a question form of an utterance does not always function as an elicitation.

4.1.6 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Elicit Exchange

Elicit exchange category has the second biggest number of exchanges found in the data. Of 1459 exchanges found, 452 exchanges or about 30.98% of overall exchanges fall in this category. These 452 exchanges are constructed by 12 patterns. The 12 patterns are (1) I, (2) I-R, (3) I-Rⁿ, (4) I-R-F, (5) I-R-F-R, (6) I-R-F-Rⁿ, (7) I-R-F-R-F-R, (8) I-Rⁿ-F, (9) I-Rⁿ-F-R, (10) I-Rⁿ-F-Rⁿ, (11) I-R/I-R, and

(12) I-R/I-Rⁿ. Among the 12 patterns, I, I-R, and I-Rⁿ are the three patterns which contribute to the most exchanges in elicit exchange category. Of the 452 exchanges found in this category, 112 exchanges are constructed by I pattern, 182 exchanges are constructed by I-R pattern, and 119 exchanges are constructed by I-Rⁿ pattern. Moreover, I-R-F-R-F-R is the pattern that cannot be found in other exchange categories but the elicit category of exchange.

Excerpt 6 is presented to show the I-R-F-R-F-R pattern found in the data:

Excerpt 6: I-R-F-R-F-R Pattern in Elicit Exchange

Line of dialogue	move	exchange structure	exchange
Tio : <i>Oh tapi sama?</i> Oh but with whom?	elicit	I	elicit
Sari : <i>Wakil rektor</i> Vice rector	informing	R	
Tio : <i>Oh pak...</i> Oh Mr...	acknowledging	F	
Sari : <i>Andi.. eh namanya?</i> Andi... eh is it his name?	acknowledging	R	
Tio : <i>Pak Andi. Aku udah ketemu o.</i> Mr. Andi. I have met (him).	acknowledging	F	
Sari : <i>Udah?Yang muda itu to?</i> (You) have? The young one, isn't (he)?	acknowledging	R	

In the data, there is only one exchange in elicit category constructed by

I-R-F-R-F-R pattern. As shown in excerpt 6, the elicited exchange with I-R-F-R-F-R pattern is started by an eliciting move at I uttered by Tio. Tio's line '*oh tapi sama?*', meaning 'oh but with whom?', at I is followed by Sari's line '*wakil rektor*', meaning 'vice rector', at R in an informing move. After Sari uttered this response, Tio tried to give a feedback by uttering '*oh pak*', meaning 'oh mr.', that was then overlapped by Sari's line in the acknowledging move at R. This overlapping happened because Tio made a pause (marked by '...' in the transcription) when delivering his utterance so that Sari had a chance to take the floor. After Sari uttered her line, Tio then continued his feedback by uttering '*Pak Andi. Aku udah ketemu o*' which means 'Mr. Andi. I have met him'. This feedback was responded by Sari through an acknowledging move '*Udah? Yang muda itu to?*' (in English: You have? The young one, isn't he?) at R. In this last line of Sari, she used a comment act with tag question marker *to* (in English: isn't it/he/she) to seek Tio's agreement for her information while elaborating the information about Mr. Andi whom became the object of Sari and Tio's conversation. However, Tio did not give any feedback to Sari's line so that the exchange ends at Sari's last R.

4.1.7 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Direct Exchange

There are five patterns found to construct 99 direct exchanges found in the data. These five patterns are (1) I, (2) I-R, (3) I-Rⁿ, (4) I-R-F, and (5) I-Rⁿ-F. Among 99 exchanges in direct exchange category, 43 exchanges are constructed by I pattern, 49 exchanges are constructed by I-R pattern, five exchanges are constructed by I-Rⁿ pattern, one exchange is constructed by I-R-F pattern, and one exchange is constructed by I-Rⁿ-F pattern.

In the data, many responses to directing moves are given in form of non-verbal responses. Non-verbal responses are realized by actions taken as consequences of the orders. Directing moves found in the data are not always followed by behaving moves realizing acceptances of the orders. Some rejections of the orders are also found in the café talk being investigated.

4.1.8 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Clarify Exchange

Among the three bound elicited exchange categories (clarify, repeat, and re-initiation), clarify exchange category has the biggest number of exchanges. There are 200 exchanges found in this category. These 200 exchanges are constructed by 12 different patterns. The patterns are (1) I^b, (2) I^b-R, (3) I^b-Rⁿ, (4)

I^b-R-F, (5) I^b-R-F-R, (6) I^b-R-F-Rⁿ, (7) I^b-R-F-R-F, (8) I^b-R-R/I-Rⁿ, (9) I^b-Rⁿ-F, (10) I^b-Rⁿ-Fⁿ-R, (11) I^b-R/I-Rⁿ, and (12) I^b-R/I-Rⁿ-F.

Among the 12 patterns, I^b, I^b-R, and I^b-Rⁿ are the three patterns which construct the most exchanges in this category. I^b pattern constructs 40 exchanges, I^b-R pattern constructs 92 exchanges, and I^b-Rⁿ pattern constructs 47 exchanges.

4.1.9 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Repeat Exchange

Among 1459 exchanges found in the data, 44 exchanges are found in repeat exchange category. There are eight patterns underlying these 44 exchanges. The patterns are (1) I^b, (2) I^b-R, (3) I^b-Rⁿ, (4) I^b-R-F, (5) I^b-Rⁿ-F-Rⁿ, (6) I^b-R/I-R, (7) I^b-R/I-Rⁿ, and (8) I^b-R/I-Rⁿ-F.

Similar to patterns in other categories, I^b, I^b-R, and I^b-Rⁿ are the three patterns that construct the most exchanges

Excerpt 7: I^b-R/I-R-F Pattern in Re-initiation Exchange

found in repeat category of exchange. I^b pattern constructs nine exchanges, I^b-R pattern constructs 12 exchanges, and I^b-Rⁿ pattern constructs 10 exchanges. The rest five patterns construct 13 exchanges in this category of exchange.

4.1.10 Patterns of Exchange Structures in Re-initiation Exchange

Among 1459 exchanges found in the data, there are only 29 exchanges found in re-initiation exchange category. These 29 exchanges are constructed by seven patterns namely (1) I^b, (2) I^b-R, (3) I^b-Rⁿ, (4) I^b-R-F, (5) I^b-R-F-R, (6) I^b-Rⁿ-F, and (7) I^b-R/I-R-F. Among these seven patterns, I^b, I^b-R, and I^b-Rⁿ patterns are the most prominent patterns found in the data, and I^b-R/I-R-F pattern is only found in re-initiation exchange category.

Excerpt 7 below shows the I^b-R/I-R-F pattern found in the data:

Line of dialogue	move	exchange structure	exchange
Sari : <i>Mana? ga ada?</i> Where? Is it not here?	eliciting	I	elicit
Ninuk : <i>Ada</i> It is	informing	R	
Sari : <i>Mana?</i> Where?	eliciting	I ^b	re-initiation
Tina : Rise after glow white or something?	eliciting	I	elicit
Ninuk : Macademiaaaa... your	informing	R	

	favorite...			
Tina	: <i>Aah jinja</i> Aaa really	acknowledging	F	
Sari	: <i>Mana gak ada... teh tarik mana?</i> It is not here... where is <i>teh tarik?</i>	eliciting	I ^b	re-initiation
Ninuk	: <i>Ini menu makanannya, ini minumannya</i> This is the menu for foods, and this is (the menu) for beverages	informing	R/I	
Sari	: <i>Di sini ada minumannya juga.</i> There are also beverages here	acknowledging	R	
Ninuk	: <i>Iya...kopinya di sini</i> Yes... the coffee is here (<i>referring to the menu</i>).	acknowledging	F	

The last four lines in excerpt 7 above show I^b-R/I-R-F pattern that cannot be found in other exchange categories. Among 29 exchanges found in re-initiation exchange category, only one exchange found to have I^b-R/I-R-F pattern.

As shown in the excerpt above, Sari tried to seek information on whether or not *teh tarik* was on the menu because she could not find it in the menu she was reading at that time. Ninuk's response for Sari's elicitation did not seem to satisfy Sari. Thus, Sari re-initiated her question in order to get a better answer. However, Sari's first re-initiation is incomplete because Tina suddenly took the floor with a new exchange that had no correlation with the information Sari wanted to get. Tina's turn was responded by two other turns at R and F uttered by Ninuk and Tina. This switch of exchange, and in fact the switch of topic too, dissatisfied Sari

who still wanted to get proper information about whether or not the café they were in had *teh tarik* on its menu. Thus, once again, Sari re-initiated the same question about *teh tarik* at I^b in a new re-initiation exchange. This line of Sari was finally responded by Ninuk in informing move at R/I. Ninuk's response is considered as R/I because it has both predicting and predicted elements on it.

Sari who did not seem to satisfy with Ninuk's response uttered another response at R. This response belongs to acknowledging move because Sari's response '*di sini ada minumannya juga*', meaning 'there are also beverages here', was aimed to acknowledge Ninuk's preceding utterance while adding new information to expand the information given by Ninuk. Ninuk and Sari were holding different menu books by the time the conversation was taking place. The menu book read by Ninuk had more

information on beverages, especially various kinds of coffee, and snacks offered by the café while the one read by Sari had more information on main courses. By uttering her line, Sari wanted to emphasize that in the menu she was reading, there were also some beverages offered, and she could not find *teh tarik* on it.

As the last turn to end this re-initiation exchange, Ninuk uttered a feedback '*iya... kopinya di sini*' meaning 'yes... the coffee is here' at F. The feedback uttered by Ninuk has two functions. First, the word '*iya*' or 'yes' is aimed to acknowledge Sari's information about beverages in the menu book Sari was reading. By uttering '*iya*', Ninuk shows her acceptance about the truth of Sari's information. Second, *kopinya di sini* is aimed to inform Sari that variants of coffee offered by the café could be read in the menu Ninuk was holding. Unfortunately, even in her last line of the exchange, Ninuk failed to provide decent information on *teh tarik* Sari wanted to get. Sari then stopped talking about *teh tarik* matter with Ninuk and decided to ask the waitress later in the conversation.

From excerpt 7, it can be concluded that re-initiation is not limited to one-time-utterance only. If the speaker feels that he/she still needs information on

something, the speaker can utter his/her re-initiation more than one time.

E. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it is found that there are 21 patterns underlying 1459 exchanges in the café talk being investigated. Among these patterns, I, I-R, and I-Rⁿ are the three patterns with the most frequent occurrences in almost all categories of exchanges in the data.

REFERENCES

- Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Francis, Gill and Susan Hunston. 1992. "Analyzing Everyday Conversation". In Malcolm Coulthard (Ed.). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 1992. London: Routledge. pp. 123-161.
- Heigham, Juanita and Robert A. Croker. 2009. *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mukhlas, Abrar. 2013. "The Pattern of Classroom Interaction and the Distribution of Turn-Taking: A Study in Two Different Classes in Jambi". A Postgraduate Thesis. The University of Diponegoro. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.

- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sinclair, John and Malcolm Coulthard. 1992. "Towards an Analysis of Discourse". In Malcolm Coulthard (Ed.). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. 1992. London: Routledge. pp. 1-34.
- , 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa (Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik)*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2005. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends* (new edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tolson, Andrew. 2006. *Media Talk (Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.