The organization of disagreement in multiparty talks: Is it culturally specific and teachable?

Ella Wulandari, M.A.
A teaching staff at English Education Department, Yogyakarta State University

Abstract

This paper scrutinizes the sequential structures of argumentations within a conflict talk among young Indonesian close friends. The data presented in this paper were collected by audiotaping and transcribing, following Conversation Analysis (CA) approach, a casual conversation among housemates. Following the sequential structure of argumentation proposed by Kangasharju (2002) and Norricks & Spitz's (2008), the analysis shows that the proposed structure is not always applicable to the data. The seemingly driving force of the argumentation organization in multiparty casual talks is the need of speakers to mitigate or delay disagreement for being a dispreferred act which can jeopardize harmonious bond among speakers. Also found is the use of comparable discourse markers in both English and Indonesian languages. Providing the audio/video and transcript of a real conversation can provide learners with authentic sample of language uses and give them an opportunity to analyze and compare the 'rules' of conversation in their first language and in the target language, which should then be applied in a pedagogical task e.g. role-play.

This paper examines the sequential structures of argumentations within a conflict talk among young Indonesian close friends. Specifically it attempts to characterize how disagreements are produced within the ongoing conversation in ways that address harmonious interactional goal as well as achieve the objective of argumentation itself. It aims to contribute to the understanding of argumentation mechanisms prevalent within dynamic and rich contexts of multiparty casual talks. It also seeks to show that such understanding is teachable and supports foreign language learners' pragmatic ability.

Talks among friends are part of everyday businesses, within which disagreements are inevitable. Since friend talks are often directed by the needs to sustain solidarity or friendship, disagreements are often seen as dispreferred acts (Pomerantz, 1984). This often results in amendment of devices of expressing conflicts or argumentations that occur, so as to preserve harmony (Georgakopoulou, 2001). Similarly, solidarity maintenance and building are prevalent in talks among Indonesians (Wouk, 2001). Wouk in particular finds that discourse markers are used to highlight agreements (not necessarily in the topic, possibly in assumed shared knowledge among participants) and lessen disagreeing sense.

In relation to foreign language teaching, the prevalence of disagreeing act in conversations calls for investigation of how disagreement is casted out in learners' first language and how it differs from their target language due to their different pragmatic conventions. Pragmatic conventions, Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006) argue, can vary significantly between cultures. This means language learners need to be taught the specific pragmatics of the target language in order to be able to communicate effectively. They suggest that learners, therefore, should be exposed to conversational analysis (CA) materials in order to learn pragmatic conventions. This is because CA materials are authentic, and genuinely show pragmatic conventions that may not exist in the imagined scripts used in many textbooks.

To provide a CA-based authentic materials, an investigation of real casual 'conflict' talks can be done through transcribing and translating a recorded conversation in learners' mother tongue into the target language. While the transcription should follow Conversation Analysis approach, the translation undoubtedly has to be carefully done particularly in translating discourse markers which often cannot be literally translated, or culturally specific. The investigation will reveal the organization of disagreements, including the structure of casting disagreement within talks, the pragmatic devices available in performing the acts, and the linguistic forms closely related to carrying out the language function. After translated, the script is available for comparison of the corresponding three aspects found in both languages. While the understanding of those aspects adds to learners' language repertoire, it enhances learners' pragmatic ability.

However, the investigation that compares the disagreements organization in a foreign language (in this case, English) and that in learners' mother tongue (in this case, Indonesian) is rarely found. Wouk's study mostly focused on uses of discourse markers as a device of solidarity in both Indonesian and English. Very few, if not, no studies have scrutinized the sequences and production of disagreements in a small-group conversation among young Indonesians who have close relationship like the case of housemates. Few research explored argumentations or conflicts in multiparty conversations for their analysis difficulties and intelligibility issues attributed to pragmatic factors like 'a lack of speaker-separated recordings, prevalence of speech overlap and disfluencies, and frequent shifts of topic or reference) (Aoki, *et.al.,* 2006, p.1).

Pomerants (1984) and Kangasharju (2002) have explored ways and devices to express agreement and disagreement in conversations in English speaking culture. Generally, they both

investigated the preference of disagreement occurred in conversations. However, Pomerants distinguishes strong agreements/disagreements from weak agreement/disagreements. A disagreement can be categorized as strong, if the response to it is completely contrastive and without agreement components or silence, hesitation markers, and repeated questions prefacing it. Otherwise, the disagreement will sound weak. Meanwhile, Kangasharju paid more attention to the alignment of two or more speakers in multi-party talk in expressing disagreement, which is different in one-to-one interaction. Looking at the structure of expressing disagreement in alliance she used in analysing her data, Kangasharju's (2002, p.1450; 1996, p.293) sequential structure of argumentation is adopted for its relevance to this paper's analysis.

A	Statement
B	Disagreement with speaker A (counter Agreement
C	Endorsement of B's turn
A	Defense, Acquiescence, Silence, etc.)

Similarly, Norricks & Spitz's (2008, p.1665) also addresses the occurrence of endorsement in their structure. The structure that takes place within three consecutive turns involves:

A:	Antecedent event/arguable action (AE/AA)	Verbal or nonverbal action
B:	Initial opposition (IO)	Disagreement with A
C:	Counter-opposition (CO)	Disagreement with B and/or supporting or insisting on A

The structure simplifies a basic opening sequence of a conflict talk that allows two or more participants involved, with focus on argumentation. It also suggests that a conflict can begin with an event or arguable (verbal) action, which Kangasharju seems not discussing. In addition, Norricks & Spitz (2008, p.1669-1670) also proposes their modified framework for ending a conflict talk, four of which are adopted to the analysis of this paper. The framework includes submission, stand-off, compromise, withdrawal, and humour attempt. Submission-ended conflict happens when one speaker keeps his/her view and the other gives up his/hers. When all speakers maintain their own opinions, the conflict ends in a stand-off. Compromise discontinues a conflict if all participants agree on a win-win solution, while withdrawal stops a conflict if one of the participants abruptly walkout of the conversation.

Methodology

This paper employs conversation analysis as the primary approach, which is according to Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) "discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of actions are generated" (p.12). So, the focus of this study will be mainly on the sequences of the talk in the conversation, how the speakers understand each other's turns, and not on other aspects outside it, such as cultural background, educational background, or personalities.

The data was collected through audio recording a casual conversation among Indonesian housemates discussing a trip plan for a mid-semester break of their postgraduate study, in an Australian university. The conversation was about three minutes and eighteen seconds long and taking place in Australia. It took place in an afternoon tea when without planned, another participant joined in the middle of it. The participants were three male and two female young Indonesians whose age ranges from 23 – 29 years old. Four of them are students at the same university, while one female participant is a male participant's wife. They have stayed in the same house for various length of time, from 6 to 12 months.

After the data is collected, they were first transcribed using detailed conversation analysis (CA) conventions, accounting for their turn-taking and sequence organizations as well as overlappings. Since the data is in Indonesian language, the translation is needed. Next, an unmotivated looking towards the data was conducted in order to observe the recurring patterns or common phenomena observed in the data. In this process, speech events dealing with argumentation generally appear more frequently in the data and are considered as what the data have to say themselves. A further look at the data revealed certain patterns and ways of disagreeing that occur so frequently that they come to an extent to be generalizable. The transcription was further divided into three excerpts where disagreements on different topics accounted. These excerpts serve as the primary data source. Specifically, we then looked at each excerpt more closely to identify the sequential structures of argumentation as proposed by Norrick & Spitz (2008) and Kangasharju (1996 & 2002), as well as identify strong and weak disagreements as characterized by Pomerantz (1984), Wouk (2001), and indirect disagreement by Georgakopolou (2001).

Analysis

Excerpt 1 part 1 portrays the sequential structure of argumentation proposed by Norrick & Spitz, as explicated in Table 1.

1.   David :   gimana nang (.) liburan nanti nang buat waduh =buat uciss maksudnya
                How is about the coming holiday Nang? Ouch. I meant for UCISS.
2.   Ria   :   hahaha ((laughing at David's 'ouch' whose leg knocked the table))
3. → Anang : *yah ya* kema- tadi kan (.) katanya pernah ng ini ngobrol sama teman
4.   teman kan eh kalo mau ke sydney *ya* [(.) kayaknya (0.1) kurang lah vid
                Yeah. um. (You) said you've talked to friends, haven't u, about planning to
                go to Sydney *um,* which seems less
5.   David :   [ya sih]
                                                             You're right.
6.   Anang : kurang mantap ha?
                It's less fun. Sorry?
7.   ??   :   (   )
8.   David : [kurang jauh?]
                (Do you mean it's) not distant enough?
9. → Anang : [ha? *Iyaa:* kurang jau[h kurang kerasa jalan [gitu loh
                Pardon? *Yes*. It's not distant enough; it doesn't feel like having a vacation.
10. David : [haha]   [*gak* aku pikirnya *gini kan*
11.   yang mau pulang kan belum rapat *tuh*=
                Haha.   *Well*, I think, *you know,* those who'll be leaving
                haven't met and discussed, right?
12. Anang : =hah? [siapa?]
                Sorry? Who?
13. David :   [aku   ] yang pulang jadi *gini* yang mau pulang *kan* aku trus
14.   kamu nang (.) trus mba ella [juli pak deden](.) *nah* kenapa ke sydney=
                (It's) me (going home). So *you know*, those who'll be going home include
                me, you, sister Ella, Juli, Mr. Deden. *So,* the reason why we're going to
                Sydney is

15. Anang :   [kamu ga bikinin?]
                                         You're not giving me one?
16. Ria   :   ((serving ice cream with cola for Anang))
17. → David : =biar skalian kita bisa ini (0.2) bisa main ke pedis (0.1) bisa blanja
                (So that) we can also go shopping to Paddy's.

                                                              (Excerpt 1 part 1)

The argumentative turns follow the argumentative structure, with similar way of ending conflict i.e. stand-off but different conflict opening. The conflict is triggered by a question in the first part but by a statement in the second. A closer look at both parts uncovers application of some devices of disagreement production that mitigate disagreements.

Structure	Turn	Functions	Markers of W/S A & D
Opening of Conflict	Turn 1	Opinion-initiating question	
Antecedent Event (AE) & initial Oposition (IO)	Turn 3	Initial opposition (expressed with Weak Disagreement (WD))	Hesitation (*yeah, um, question tag*), pauses.
	Turn 8	Initial opposition (expressed with Strong Disagreement (DA))	Within one turn, no agreement preface(s), no hesitation, strong '*yes*' that enforces his argument.
Counter Oposition (CO)	Turn 4	Preface agreement (Weak Argument (WA))	*You're right.*
	Turn 9	Counter opposition initiation	Laughter, (discourse markers) *well, you know*
	Turn 12	Counter opposition building	
	Turn 16	Counter opposition final (expressed with WD)	Pauses
End of Conflict	Turn 17	Statement	Coming from different speaker Topic swift ➔ stand off

Table 1. The sequential structure of excerpt 1(a) (Going to Sydney)

In the first part, the speakers seem to systematically delay their opposing arguments and build their turns in such a way that appears to highlight commonness and mitigate differences. Turn 3 shows that Anang uses 'pro-forma agreement' (*yah, ya)* because he was going to launch a dispreferred turn. Disagreement is often seen as a dispreferred response because in any conversations agreement is preferable for its solidarity maintenance function. In Indonesian conversation, Wouk (2001, p.178) observed the same phenomenon and argues that

> 'disagreements, pre-disagreements, and delayed, dispreferred SPPs also often begin with *iya* or *ya,* just as English conversation such moves often begin with a pro-forma agreement, due to the preference for agreement in conversation'.

Further, they seem to employ 'preface statements' that provide background knowledge assumed to have been shared by the other participant. Besides hesitation and agreement particle of *ya,* Anang said about their plan of going to Sydney, which none of the participants have stated before, including David, whose question elicits opinions (turn 1). In this way, Anang seems to show that something is shared while requesting agreement or verification on what is being said is true or recognized. Such request is indicated by use of question tag *kan (**haven't you***).

Supporting, Wouk states that '(...) interrogative tags typically have meanings of requesting agreement or verification (although they don't always get it)' (p.183). In fact, *kan* is just another Indonesian marker for agreement. Of further interest is that the shared knowledge seems to be the idea in conflict as well as the disagreement point, which is uttered by Anang himself who is, at the same time, opposing the idea. This happens, as it seems that Anang assumed a shared knowledge about their previous plan to go to Sydney. Since there are no specific utterances that state the assumed plan, it can hardly be confirmed whether such assumption is true. Another way of explaining this is the possibility that David was expecting Anang to come up with an idea and bring it to the floor for eliciting different opinions. Yet, Anang takes his turn in two ways: as a precursor and a response to it. As a result, Anang's turn serves as both the 'arguable event' and his own 'initial opposition'.

Meanwhile, use of hesitation, pauses, discourse markers (*well, you know*) in this part indicates speakers' attempts to hide disagreements. At first, Anang presented a WD (turn 3) and gradually put forwad his SD (turn 9). A gradual systematic way of building disagreement is also shown in David's turns, which clearly show the delaying disagreement to the last turn. Interestingly, David agrees with Anang (turn 5) which is in contrast with his ultimate disagreement (turn 26). In this regard, Pomerantz (1984) claims that agreeing with the prior speaker's position as a preface to disagreement is usual in conflicting talks. Concerning this, Pomerantz (1984, p.77) strongly argues that

> "the combination of conversant' delaying or withholding their disagreements together with fellow conversants' modifying their positions permits stated disagreements to be minimized and stated agreements to be maximized".

In the second part of excerpt 1 (below), similar sequential structure of argumentations is also found (Table 2).

18.	David :	[itu] mba ella stuju tuh
		See, sister Ella agrees.
19. ➔	Anang :	[*yeh*] *ya* tapi kan kalo ke pedis saja kan gak harus rame ramee: gitu kan
20.		bisa (0.1) apa *ya* (0.2) kelompok aja kalo mo blanja lamaa:: mo blanja
21.		dari pagi ampe siang pas belanja doang kan enak, mo borong sekapal
22.		bisa=
		Um.Yeah.. But going to Paddy's doesn't need to be in crowds. Just in a small group. We can *ee* shop from dusk till dawn, even you can if you want to buy things as many as the ship can take.
23.	David :	=*ya sih*

Yeah, you're *right*.

24.   Anang :   [enaknya yang jauh cuman
   Better more distant but

25. → David :   [cuma *kan* memanfaatkan momen jadi ga (0.2) kalo misalnya yang
26.   banyak yang setuju *ya* udah dua kali ke Sydney
   But it's about the moment too, *isn't it?* (Though) if many agree, *ee* we will have been to Sydney twice.

27.   Anang :   eh ya =yang (0.1) *eh* tempat itu kah yang kemarin diusulin tuh mana?
28.   yang dekatnya three sisters itu
   By the way, what about the place *um* you suggested yesterday, which is close to Three Sisters?

(Excerpt 1 part 2)

Structure	Turn	Functions	Markers of W/S A & D
Antecedent Event/ Arguable action (AE/AA)	Turn 18	Argument-initiating statement	
Initial Oposition (IO)	Turn 19	Initial opposition (expressed with WD)	Hesitation (*um, yeah*), pauses
	Turn 23	Preface agreement (WA)	*Ya sih* (you're right)
Counter Oposition (CO)	Turn 25	Counter opposition (expressed with WD)	*But* (showing contrast), hesitation (*ee*), agreement particle (question tag) & pauses.
End of Conflict (EC)	Turn 27	Topic swift showing speakers keep their stances (**stand-off**)	Question

Table 2. The sequential structure of excerpt 1 part 2 (Going to Paddy's, Sydney)

Similar to Anang, David appears to employ preface statements which allow him to highlight some shared knowledge among them, when he mentioned about the fact that they are going to leave for home at the end of their studies. This again indicates disagreements being delayed and agreement (on shared knowledge) being highlighted. Interestingly, David showed a WA (turn 5) long before he finally uttered his WD (turn 26). This confirms that disagreements can be delayed between, within, and across turns by means of hesitations (turn 13), request for clarification (turn 8, 10) and questioning repeats (Georgakopoulou, 2001). He also uses discourse markers and laughter to soften disagreements.

Concerning the production of disagreements, WDs are still dominant in this second part, where prefaced agreement, hesitation markers, pauses, agreement particle (question tag) and a coordinator *but* are noticed. According to Pomerantz, '*but*' reinforces that the agreement which prefaces the disagreement serves merely as 'agreement tokens' or 'weakened agreements' (1985, p.72).

While excerpt 1 has statements as its antecedent/arguable event, a question is used for the same purpose in excerpt 2 turn 48 (below) while simultaneously projects a disagreement for opposing the idea discussed beforehand i.e. going to Sydney and Paddy's, in an indirect manner.

48. Anang :   kamu kemana wi?
                     Where do you want to go Wi?
49. Dewi :   *gak* kalo misalnya mau blanja kayak oleh oleh gitu knapa gak skalian
50.   ke melbourne yang [yang victoria supermarketnya lebih gede=
                *Well, i*f we want to buy some souvenirs, why don't we go to Melbourne whose Victoria supermarket is much bigger?

→ 51. Anang :   [gila jauh banget hahaha
                You're kidding. It's so distant hahaha
52. Dewi :   =[dan (0.5) dan tempatnya=
                And the place
53. Ria   :   [halo baru datang ya? ((welcoming Wira))
                 Halo just arrived?
→ 54. Dewi :   =juga [*yaa:h* kalo mau jauh skalian *gitu* loh
                 Well, if you want a more distant place *(don't u?).*
55. Anang :   [kamu pernah ke melbourne?
                 Have you been to Melbourne?
→ 56. David :   *gak* mikirnya [biar skalian gitu mungkin juga ada teman teman yang
57.   belum pernah ke sydnee:y
                Well, I just think that maybe some friends haven't been to Sydney
→ 58. Anang :   [transportasinya *bo::*
                 The transportation, *plea::se*
59. Dewi :   o[kay
                Okay.

                                                      (Excerpt 2)

Georgakopoulou (2001, p.1894) asserts that indirect disagreements can be realized through specific turn-initial markers, stories as analogy for discussing the topic at hand and questions. In this way, turn 48 performs the function that she further proposes, that is not to request an answer but more to challenge the current speaker's opinion. Such function is confirmed since the following turn (turn 49) opposes to the idea presented in the question. This initial opposition is then counter-opposed followed by an endorsement (turn 56).

Applying Kangasharju's 'endorsement' concept to Excerpt 2, 3 and 4 (see Appendix 1) one will likely find, besides their typical sequential structure of disagreements, endorsement given to one speaker to the other participant. Kangasharju says endorsements indicate speakers' alliance toward one side of 'the house'. The following table describes the occurrences of endorsement in excerpt 2.

Structure	Turn	Functions	Markers of W/S A & D
Opening of conflict	Turn 48	Opinion-eliciting question	
AE/AA	Turn 49	Arguments-eliciting question (SD, indirect)	Discourse marker (*gak*='well'), question
IO^1	Turn 51	SD	You're kidding *(gila)* but with laughter, within one turn (no agreement preface)
CO	Turn 54	WD	Discourse marker (well), question tag *(gitu loh* = 'don't u')
Endorsement	Turn 56	Endorsement to turn 45 (SD)	within one turn (no agreement preface)
IO^2	Turn 58	SD	within one turn (no agreement preface)
EC	Turn 59	Assent ➔ submission	Agreement particle (*okay*)

Table 3. The sequential structure of excerpt 2 (Going to Melbourne)

Other things that differentiate excerpt 2 from the previous ones are the presence of two IOs and the way the conflicting arguments on the ongoing topic are discontinued. The second IO is not confronted back with another CO. Instead, the speaker (turn 59) clearly assents to the prior speakers' view using an agreement token *okay* and lead her to subsume to the opposing argument, which ends the conflict.

Similar to excerpt 1, excerpt 3 (below) has a question as its conflict opening and topic-swift for ending the argumentation. Its sequence of arguments, however, differs in that some turns have similar functions (turn 89 & 93 functioning as IO; turn 99 & 100 functioning as O), which clearly reflects alignment between Anang and David, who both oppose Wira. In addition, it is not an endorsement that follows CO but another sequence of arguments. Since it is not in

initial position, they are labelled as 'opposition'. Regarding production of disagreements, question repeat is observed for signalling WD (Pomerantz, 1985). Recurring use of agreement prefaces to mitigate disagreement and question for displaying disagreement as found in previous excerpts is also found.

89. Wira   :   oh (1.0) ini aja gold coast
                   Oh. What about Gold Coast?
→ 90. David   :   gold coast?
                   Gold Coast?
91. Wira   :   *ya*
                   Yes.
92. Dewi   :   *he* [lebih jauh lagi *kan* usulan dia?
                   Huh. His suggestion is much far-away, *is his not*?
→ 93. Anang   :   [pergi ke gold coast?]
                   Going to Gold Coast?
→ 94. Wira   :   skalian aja jauh=
                   (Why not) make it distant
95. Dewi   :   =*tuh kan* bener haha
                   See? I am right, *aren't I*? Haha.
96. Ria   :   haha
97. Dewi   :   skalian jauh *kan* haha
                   Let's choose even the farthest, *right*. Haha
98. David   :   [bisa sih cuma *kan=*
                   Well, we can, but *ee*
→ 99. Anang   :   [mau nyewa bis? kamu mau naik apaan?
                   (Are we) going to hire a bus? How do you get there?
→ 100.   David :   =kita pertimbangkan biaya juga [temen-temen
                   Let's consider the cost friends
101.   Anang :   [nah itu lah
                                                     That's right.
102.   Wira   :   ( )
103.   (0.8)
104.   Anang :   ye iye (.)
                   Of course.
105.   Wira   :   gini aja [(.)
                   What about this

(Excerpt 3)

Structure	Turn	Functions	Markers of W/S A & D
AE	Turn 89	Opinions-eliciting question	
IO^1	Turn 90	WD	Question repeat
IO^2	Turn 93	WD	Question repeat

CO	Turn 94	SD	Within one turn, no agreement preface(s), no hesitation
	Turn 99	Agreement preface to O2 (WA)	*But*
O[1]	Turn 99	Opposition 1 (SD, indirect)	Question
O[2]	Turn 100	Opposition 2 (WD)	Prefaced by agreement turn (91)
Endorsement	Turn 101	Endorsement to prior's sp.	(agreement token) *That's right*
EC	Turn 105	Topic switch ➔ stand off	

Table 4. The sequential structure of excerpt 3 (Going to Gold Coast)

Conclusion and Implication to Teaching

From the analysis, three aspects can be revealed. First, it is shown that the sequential of argumentative structures proposed by Norricks & Spitz and Kangasharju cannot always be directly applied to multiparty talks in similar consecutive sequences, since overlapping is prevalent in multiparty conversations. Secondly, the desire to postpone and mitigate disagreement seems to be the driving force of sequencing and producing disagreements by the speakers. To delay display disagreements, speakers often preface them with statements (of assumed background knowledge) or weak agreements. Endorsement, in forms of supporting arguments and agreement token *'That's right',* is of particular observation since it displays speaker(s)' alliance with one of the opposing sides. Apparently, weak agreements indicated with *'but'* within or across turns seem to be used only as a preface to disagreements. Hesitation and discourse markers, pauses, and question repeat are often made use by the speakers. Strong disagreements are apparent in the data through strong 'yes' and produced within a single utterance with no preface or hesitation. Third, apart from the validity of the transcript's translation, discourse markers in Indonesian seem to always have their corresponding expressions in English (Wouk, 2001). As in the case of question tags, while Indonesian has some popular question tags such as *'kan?, ya kan?* or *betul kan?,* English question tags are distinct in that they depend on the verbs being used in the utterance. The comparison of this particular use of discourse markers also reflects the pragmalinguistic aspect of learners' pragmatic ability (Leech, 1983).

Showing disagreements are indeed not a simple speech acts even in first language (L1) as it is deemed as a dispreferred action that threatens bond of solidarity and alliance. As such, to disagree with others, one has to be aware of the possible argumentative turn sequences and available linguistic and contextual devices that might help put disagreements forwards without jeopardizing his/her association with the opposing parties. This calls for the urgency of giving explicit instruction in language classrooms on mechanism of conflicting talks. Providing learners with CA-based transcripts of conversations performing certain speech acts, language teachers can assist learners to analyse these materials and determine the 'rules' of conversation in the target language, and later compare those in target language and in their first language. These are then reflected upon and practiced in the classroom using role-plays. While the transcript the paper has presented is potential as an input or example of authentic language use, further practices through, for example role-playing argumentative speech events in small groups should be encouraged. This can be enhanced by also presenting the video of people having argumentation in a conversation since Dufon argues that the best materials for teaching pragmatics are ones that are authentic and show clear pragmatic social and linguistic conventions (2004).

Concerning foreign language classroom, comparison of how disagreeing acts are realized in learners' native language will raise their awareness of corresponding expressions used in the same acts in the target language (TL). It will add to their language repertoire particularly their pragmatic ability and thus increase their confidence in utilizing comparable expressions in the TL. Very often, L2 teachers are not confident to model a culturally appropriate speech event or act for they simply do not know how to perform similar ones in their own first language and culture. In the end, attempt to compare and analyze disagreements in learners' first language and in the TL will enhance the teaching of conversation particularly in foreign language teaching contexts.

References

Aoki, Paul. M. Szymanski, Margaret. H., Plurkowski, L., Thornton, James. D., Woodruff, A., Yi, W. (2006). Where's the "party" in "multi-party?: Analyzing the structure of small-group sociable talk. *CSCW*. retrieved on March 21, 2011.

Dufon, M. (2004). Producing a video for teaching pragmatics in the second or foreign language classroom. *Prospect*, 19(1), 65-83

Georgakopoulou, A. (2001). Arguing about the future: on indirect disagreements in conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33,* 1881 – 1900.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. London: Polity press.

Huth, T., & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 53-79.

Kangasharju, H. (1996). Aligning as a team in multiparty conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 26, 291--319

Kangasharju, H. (2002). Alignment in disagreement: forming oppositional alliances in committee meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34, 1447–1471.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* Essex: Longman Group UK Limited

Norrick, N.R. and Spitz, A. (2008). Humor as a resource for mitigating conflict in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40, 1661–1686.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: some features of prefered/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson, J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: the discourse marker *ya. Journal of Pragmatics, 33,* 171-191.

Appendix 1   **Excerpt 1 (topic: going to Sydney)-→ 00:08 – 01:21**

1.   David :   gimana nang (.) liburan nanti nang buat waduh =buat uciss maksudnya

      How is about the coming holiday Nang? Ouch. I meant for UCISS.

2.   Ria   :   hahaha ((laughing at David's 'ouch' whose leg knocked the table))

3.→ Anang :   *yah ya* kema- tadi kan (.) katanya pernah ng ini ngobrol sama teman

4.   teman kan eh kalo mau ke sydney *ya* [(.) kayaknya (0.1) kurang lah vid

                 Yeah. um. (You) said you've talked to friends, haven't u, about

                 planning to go to Sydney *um,* which seems less

5.   David :   [ya sih]

                                                                  You're right.

6.   Anang :   kurang mantap ha?

                  It's less fun. Sorry?

7.   ??   :   (   )

8.   David :   [kurang jauh?]

                  (Do you mean it's) not distant enough?

9.→   Anang :   [ha? *Iyaa:* kurang jau[h kurang kerasa jalan [gitu loh

                  Pardon? *Yes*. It's not distant enough; it doesn't feel like having a

                  vacation.

10.   David :   [haha]   [*gak* aku pikirnya *gini kan*

11.   yang mau pulang kan belum rapat *tuh*=

                  Haha.   *Well*, I think, *you know,* those who'll be leaving

                  haven't met and discussed, right?

12.   Anang :   =hah? [siapa?]

                  Sorry? Who?

13.   David :   [aku   ] yang pulang jadi *gini* yang mau pulang *kan* aku trus

14.   kamu nang (.) trus mba ella [juli pak deden](.) *nah* kenapa ke sydney=

                  (It's) me (going home). So *you know*, those who'll be going home

                  include me, you, sister Ella, Juli, Mr. Deden. *So,* the reason why we're

                  going to Sydney is

15.   Anang :   [kamu ga bikinin?]

                                                You're not giving me one?

16.	Ria	:	((serving ice cream with cola for Anang))

17. → David : =biar skalian kita bisa ini (0.2) bisa main ke pedis (0.1) bisa blanja

(So that) we can also go shopping to Paddy's.

18. Ella : Stuju

Agree.

19. David : [itu] mba ella stuju tuh

See, sister Ella agrees.

20. → Anang : [*yeh*] *ya* tapi kan kalo ke pedis saja kan gak harus rame ramee: gitu kan

21. bisa (0.1) apa *ya* (0.2) kelompok aja kalo mo blanja lamaa:: mo blanja

22. dari pagi ampe siang pas belanja doang kan enak, mo borong sekapal

23. bisa=

Um.Yeah.. But going to Paddy's doesn't need to be in crowds. Just in a
small group. We can *ee* shop from dusk till dawn, even you can if you
want to buy things as many as the ship can take.

24. David : =*ya* sih

Yeah, you're *right*.

25. Anang : [enaknya yang jauh cuman

Better more distant but

26. → David : [cuma *kan* memanfaatkan momen jadi ga (0.2) kalo misalnya yang

27. banyak yang setuju *ya* udah dua kali ke Sydney

But it's about the moment too, *isn't it?* (Though) if many agree, *ee* we
will have been to Sydney twice.

28. Anang : eh ya =yang (0.1) *eh* tempat itu kah yang kemarin diusulin tuh mana?

29. yang dekatnya three sisters itu

By the way, what about the place *um* you suggested yesterday, which
is close to Three Sisters?

30.	David :	( )

31.	Anang :	apa namanya?

What's its name?

32.	David :	ha?

Humour 1

33.	Anang :	yang dekatnya three sisters itu apa namanya?

What's its name, which is near Three Sisters?

34.	David :	two sisters?

Two Sisters?

35.	Anang :	(yee::h) yang kamu usulin kemaren

(Yee), which you suggested yesterday

36.	David :	ooh ini apa namanya (.)

Oh, that one. What's its name?

37.	Anang :	sendok

Spoon.

38.	((asking for a spoon to Ria)

39.	David :	gua::: gua gua *pokoknya*

It's a cave, *that's all I know*.

40.	Anang :	gua maharani?=

Maharani cave?

41.	David :	=gua

Cave

42.	Anang :	hahaha [ke lamongan dong] ➔ joke going on

Hahaha going to Lamongan then

43.	David :	[iya cuman itu apa?] ➔ tried to 'fail' the joke

Yes, but what is it's name?

44.	Ria	: [ga deh

No way

45.	Anang :	[haha

46.	David :	haha aku gak begitu tau guanya kayak apa ➔ laughing @ the joke

Haha I just have no idea how the cave is like

47.	Dewi :	aduh duh duh

Ouch ouch ouch

Appendix 2   **Excerpt 2 (going to Melbourne) → 01:43 – 02:05**

48.   Anang :   kamu kemana wi?

       Where do you want to go Wi?

49.   Dewi :   *gak* kalo misalnya mau blanja kayak oleh oleh gitu knapa gak skalian

50.   ke melbourne yang [yang victoria supermarketnya lebih gede=

       *Well, i*f we want to buy some souvenirs, why don't we go to

       Melbourne whose Victoria supermarket is much bigger?

51. → Anang :   [gila jauh banget hahaha

                    You're kidding. It's very much distant hahaha

52.   Dewi :   =[dan (0.5) dan tempatnya=

        And the place

53.   Ria :   [halo baru datang ya? ((welcoming Wira))

        Halo just arrived?

54. → Dewi :   =juga [*yaa:h* kalo mau jauh skalian *gitu* loh

         Well, if you want a more distant place *(don't u?).*

55.   Anang :   [kamu pernah ke melbourne?

            Have you been to Melbourne?

56. → David :   *gak* mikirnya [biar skalian gitu mungkin juga ada teman teman yang

57.   belum pernah ke sydnee:y

       Well, I just think that maybe some friends haven't been to Sydney

58. → Anang :   [transportasinya *bo::*

                    The transportation, *plea::se*

59.   Dewi :   o[kay

       Okay.

60.	Anang :	[kamu blum pernah ke sydney wi?
		Haven't you been to Syndey Wi?
61.	David :	[blum pernah ke apa?
		Haven't been to where?
62.	Dewi :	udah beberapa kali
		I have several times
63.	Ria :	[berapa hitung dong]
		How many? Please count.
64.	David :	[ke itu apa namanya?] opera house [trus] kita skalian mampir blanja=
		We're going to Opera House and drop by for shopping
65.	Dewi :	[okay]
66.	David :	=yah kalo temen temen mau sih
		Well, that's up to you friends
67.	Ria :	yuk gabung (.) sini
		Come and join
68.	Wira :	ha? [oh ya ya
		Ha? Yes. Yes.
69.	Ria :	[ngomongin liburan
		(We're) discussing next holiday
70.	Wira :	ntar dulu=
		A minute
71.	Ria :	=mau kemana?
		Where are you going?
72.	(0.5)	
73.	Wira :	ntar kalian mau kemana?
		Where are you going?
74.	Anang :	liburan pengen kemana?
		Where are you going this holiday?
75.	(0.5)	
76.	Wira :	pengen kerja
		I want to work
77.	Ria :	p(h)engen kerja
		(He wants) to work
78.	Anang :	trus gak libur ini lo:h yang=

No, this coming break

79. Ria   :   =tengah semester

Mid break

80. Anang :   he eh

Right.

81. Wira   :   gak kemana-mana gua, kalian mau kemana? =wah mantap

I am going nowhere. What about you? That's great

82. Anang :   ya:: kan banyak yang mau pulang toh ra

Well, there are so many people going home Ra.

83. Wira   :   kemana?

Where?

84. Anang :   kan mau banyak yang mau pulang

(Since) many will be going home.

85. Wira   :   oh iya iya iya jadi seblum pulang bakal jalan jalan dulu

Oh I see. So before going home, (you all) will have some trips

86. Anang :   jalan jalan dulu [gitu deh]

Have some trips, you're right.

87. Wira   :   [mantap] kemana nih?

Great. Where?

88. Anang :   nah yah k(h)ita nanya nanya dulu

That's it. We're asking each other's opinions.

Appendix 3 **Excerpt 3 (going to Gold Coast) → 02:49 – 03:11**

89. Wira : oh (1.0) ini aja gold coast
Oh. What about Gold Coast?

90.→ David : gold coast?
Gold Coast?

91. Wira : *ya*
Yes.

92. Dewi : *he* [lebih jauh lagi *kan* usulan dia?
Huh. His suggestion is much far-away, *is his not*?

93.→ Anang :   [pergi ke gold coast?]
Going to Gold Coast?

94.→ Wira : skalian aja jauh=
(Why not) make it distant

95. Dewi : =*tuh kan* bener haha
See? I am right, *aren't I*? Haha.

96. Ria : haha

97. Dewi : skalian jauh *kan* haha
Make it far-away, *right*. Haha

98. David : [bisa sih cuma *kan*=
Well, we can, but *ee*

99. →Anang : [mau nyewa bis? kamu mau naik apaan?
(Are we) going to hire a bus? How do you get there?

100.→ David : =kita pertimbangkan biaya juga [temen-temen
Let's consider the cost friends

101. Anang :   [nah itu lah
That's right.

102. Wira : ( )

103. (0.8)

104. Anang : ye iye (.)
Of course.

105. Wira : gini aja [(.)
What about this

106. Anang :   [ma::k haha
Oh no haha