

# CLAUSES AS AN EXCHANGE: NEGOTIATING CULTURE BETWEEN EFL STUDENTS AND AN ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKER

Titis Sulistyowati, S.S. M.Pd  
English Education Department  
Teachers Training and Education Faculty  
Muria Kudus University

## Abstract

*To communicate effectively, we should organize the messages that we want to convey through conversation clearly. The organization of messages involves giving and demanding and this exchange might be more complicated than it seems. If we are demanding something, it means we are inviting to give, and if we are giving something, it means we are inviting to receive. That is the way exchanging something in communication. We are not only doing something ourselves, but we are also requiring something from our opponents. This interaction is called an exchange, in which giving implies receiving and demanding implies giving in response. The fourth semester students of the English Education Department of Muria Kudus University have experienced of conducting conversations with an English native speaker. The participants in this conversation obviously are having different background of language as their mother tongue and also coming from different culture. Therefore i assume that they will have different techniques in exchanging the information. The main purpose of the study is explaining how the participants are exchanging meaning realized in conversation between the students and the native speaker. The data source of this study is one transcription of the students and an English oral communication. The steps in analysing the data are; classifying the turns, clauses, moves produced by the participants, then analysing the speech functions classes base on Eggins and Slade "Analysing Casual Conversation"; explaining the commodities exchange in the conversation. From the result of this study I hope I can figure out whether the students and the native speaker have managed an acceptable and well structured casual conversation. It is very necessary in order to give some valuable suggestion for the teaching and learning English as a foreign language.*

**Keywords:** *clauses, exchange, speech function, culture*

## INTRODUCTION

Based on its orientations, Eggins & Slade (1997: 18-20) differentiate the nature of conversation in to pragmatically oriented and casual conversation. Pragmatic conversation refers to pragmatically oriented interaction, it is conducted in serious tone and companied by various expressions of politeness (e.g. would that be...? Thanks very much, just a moment). While casual conversation is not motivated by a clear pragmatic purpose, which display informality and humor. It also sometimes includes informal characteristics such as colloquial expressions of agreement (e.g. yeah, yep).

In the nature of conversation, simultaneously a message is organized and delivered among the speakers. This organization of message is carried out in the act of speaking conducted by the participants in the conversation. Messages in conversation, explained by

Halliday (1994: 68) can be recognized as speech role. The messages are conveyed in just two terms; giving and demanding. Either the speaker is giving something to the listener or he is demanding something from him.

As foreign language learners, the students have limitation in speaking ability. Instead of understanding other aspects in studying foreign language, such as cultural differences, social interactions, and the politeness norms, they also find other difficulties on discourse, lexis and grammar, and phonology/pronunciation, and also vocabulary. Their English is influenced much by their mother tongue, Javanese and Indonesian. So how they make their English understandable in the international communication, probably will become the biggest problem in teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Indonesia.

One of aspects in conversational structure is realized through the speech function choices in the conversation moves used by both students and foreigners. Through this observation I expect that I can observe their capabilities in applying their grammar knowledge from their speaking class into real social roles, such as negotiating the relationship of solidarity and intimacy in participating in the oral communication. Take for example, when they are conducting a conversation with a foreigner and the student should take the first turn, to open the communication, what speech function they will use, and how they will react to such reaction or move from his opponent. Those steps will deliberately give some interesting aspects to analyze.

By observing the English Department students' interaction in communicating with English speakers from the native countries, I expect that I can gain clear illustrations on their abilities in constructing conversational structure. The major problem I want to solve in this study is how the speech function is used in casual conversations between the English students of Muria Kudus University and the foreigners, which is elaborated in terms of speech function choices and the mood choices. The focus of the data interpretation is on the commodity exchange in the interaction.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **Clauses as an Exchange**

A chance of a person speaking in a conversation is called turn. There is probably more than one move in one turn. However speech functions can be analyzed through realization of moves. Eggins and Slade explain that a move is a unit after which the speaker change could occur without turn transfer being seen as an interruption. The end of a move indicates an idea that the speaker could stop at that point. Move and clause are distinct units, but moves are realized in clauses. (1997: 184-186)

Based on Eggins and Slade (1997: 186), there are two criteria in determining whether a clause is a move:

- i) the grammatical dependence or independence of the clause (whether the clause has made independent selection of mood);
- ii) prosodic factors (whether the end of a clause corresponds to the end of a rhythmic/intonation unit).

Eggin and Slade (1997: 74-82) also state that at the clause level, the major pattern which enact roles and roles relation are those of moods. Mood refers to the pattern of clause type, such imperative, interrogative and declarative. As a set of basic clause constituents, mood consists of a Subject and a Finite, a Predicator and some combination of Complements or Adjuncts. Subject is the participant (person or thing) in the clause. Predicator encodes the action or process involved in the clause. Compliment is a participant which is implicated in the proposition, but it is not the pivotal participant. Adjunct is the element which is additional and its function is to add extra information about the event express in the proposition.

Eggin and Slade (1997: 222) also add more information about the relation between the speech function and the exchange which occur naturally in conversation as the it is conducted. 'The speech function analysis lead us to identify larger units than moves as in the flow of interaction. It is called as exchange. An exchange can be defined as sequence of moves concered with negotiating a proposition stated or implied in an initiating move. An exchange is started with an opening move and continuing until another opening occurs.

### **Negotiation**

Eggin and Slade ( 1997: 169-170) explain that the achievements in interaction involve a functional interpretation of dialogue as the exchange of speech functions which then realize in turns and moves taken by both interactants. The pattern of confrontation and support express in conversational structure enable interactants to explore and adjust their alignment and intimacy with each other and in achieving their negotiated commodity. An opportunity to explore affective involvement, offers context for finding out who is closely aligned with whom, and what alignments could be negotiated.

In examining a dialogue, Eggin and Slade (1997: 179) suggest two ways; from the point of view grammar (mood clauses) and discourse (move in context). First tells us about social roles in culture; second tells about how participants negotiating relationship of solidarity and intimacy. Those two understandings according to Eggin and Slade's opinion, explain how participants enact their interpersonal differences in casual conversation, and how power is negotiated through talk.

### **Speech Function Classes**

Eggin and Slade (1997: 192) describe the speech functions and their sub classes in a speech function network. The speech functions are opening speech function and sustaining speech function. There are two kinds of opening speech functions; attending and initiating. Sustaining speech functions can be elaborated in to continuing speech function and reacting speech function. There are two kind of reacting speech functions, they are reacting speech function; responding and reacting speech function; rejoinder.

### **Opening Speech Function**

There are two main opening moves; attending move and initiating move. Attending move intents to search attention from the other interactant in the conversation, while initiating move deals with giving and demanding, exchanging goods, services or information as the commodities of the conversation. Opening moves are not elliptically dependent on prior

moves, they are usually cohesive in other non structural ways, such as through lexical or referential cohesion. (Eggin and Slade, 1997: 192-193)

Table 1 Speech function labels for opening moves

Speech function	Example
Attending	Hey, David!
Offer	Would you like some more wind?
Command	Look
Statement: fact	You met his sister
Statement: opinion	This conversation needs Allenby.
Question: open: fact	What's Allenby doing these days?
Question: closed: fact	Is Allenby living in London?
Question: open: opinion	What do we need here?
Question: closed: opinion	Do we need Allenby in this conversation?

Source; Eggin and Slade, 1997: 194

### Sustaining Speech Function

Sustaining moves keep negotiating the same proposition. Sustaining talk maybe achieved by the speaker who has just been talking (continuing speech functions) or by other speakers taking a turn as he react to the first one (reacting speech function). (Eggin and Slade, 1997:195)

### Sustaining: continuing speech functions

Continuing speech functions keep negotiating the same proposition produced by the same speaker who has just been talking. Continuing speech functions have two main options: to monitor, to prolong, and to append. (Eggin and Slade, 1997: 195)

Table2 Summary of Continuing Speech Function

Speech Function	Example
Continue: monitor	You know? Right?
Prolog: elaborate	At least he's doing well-at least he is doing well in London. <i>He's cleaning them up</i>
Prolog: extend	Well, we've got a whole lot of garbage tins that's good. <i>But you have got to fill them up before everyone else does</i>
Prolog: enhance	Maybe it's easy. <i>Then if you have a story .... you can speak</i>
Append: elaborate	St: What is the different between Yogya and others? t: what is the different between Yogya and the

	others? St: <i>Yogya with others ... Surabaya and umm ...</i>
Append: extend	t: Prambanan Ramayana? Do you know? St: No, it's new t: <i>maybe we are going to Kaliurang</i>
Append: enhance	t: For me this time is for business St: umm... business? t: <i>So, that's why I 'm going to different places of Java.</i>

Source: Eggins and Slade, 1997:201

**Reacting speech functions: responding**

There are two types of reacting moves: responses and rejoinder. Responses are reactions which move the exchange toward completion, while rejoinders are reactions which in some way prolong the exchange.

Responding reactions negotiate a proposition or proposal set up by the previous speaker. There are two options of responding; supporting and confronting. Supporting move require response while confronting moves are dispreferred or discretionary responses. Supporting moves are subdivided into developing, engaging, registering, and replying, while confronting are disengaging and replying.

Table 3 summary of sustaining responding speech function

Speech function	Example
Engage	Hi- <i>Hi</i> Nick- <i>Yea</i>
Register	That's our claning lady <i>-Oh, the cleaning lady</i>
Comply	Can you pass me the salt please? <i>-here [pass it]</i>
Accept	Have another? <i>-thanks [take one]</i>
Agree	Jill's very bright actually. <i>- She is extremely bright.</i>
Acknowledge	D' you remember? <i>-Oh, yea</i>
Answer	Where's Allenby? <i>-In London</i>
Affirm	Have you heard from him lately? <i>-Yes, I have</i>
Disagree	Is he in London now? <i>-No</i>

Non-comply	Could you pass me the salt, please? <i>-No, sorry/can' reach.</i>
Withhold	When is he due back? <i>-I've no idea</i>
Disavow	Did he? <i>-I didn't know that</i>
Contradict	You know? <i>-No</i>

Source: Eggins and Slade, 1997: 208

**Reacting speech functions: rejoinder**

Eggins and Slade (1997: 207) simply state that rejoinder moves are moves to set underway sequence of talk that interrupt, postpone, abort, or suspend the initial speech function sequence. The moves do not only negotiate what is already on the talk but also give further understanding and details. Rejoinder is not only negotiate what is already on the table but it query it (demanding further details) or reject it (offering alternative explanation)

Table 4 Summary or sustaining rejoinder speech function

Speech function	Example
Check	... and straight into the mandies- <i>Straight into the what?</i>
Confirm	Well he rang Roman-he rang Roman a week ago- <i>did he?</i>
Clarify	Well he rang Roman-he rang Roman a week ago – <i>What he rang Denning Road, did he?</i>
Probe	[nods] <i>Because Roman lives in Denning road also?</i>
Resolve	What's her name? <i>It's Stefanie, I think.</i>
Detach	What, before bridge? <i>-So huh [non verbal]</i>
Rebound	This conversation needs Allenby- <i>Oh he's in London so what can we do?</i>
Counter	<i>You know?- No, you don't understand Nick-you?</i>
Refute	<i>I-no no – I always put out the garbage.</i>
Re-challenge	<i>Well he rang Roman- he rang roman a week ago.</i>

Source: Eggins and Slide, 1997: 213

**METHODOLOGY**

The subjects in this study were three students and one tourist from America. The students were the third semester students of the English Education department at Muria Kudus University, Central Java, Indonesia, while the tourist is a foreigner from America who

spent their vacations at Yogyakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. The data source of this study was transcription derived from the students and the tourist' oral communication.

In this research, I classified the units of analysis into turns, moves and exchanges as the discourse analysis. One turn consisted of several moves. Moves were realized through clauses and an exchange consists of several moves. The data gathered were then analyzed through these following procedures:

- (1) Identifying the turn of each speaker.
- (2) Identifying the number of clause.
- (3) Identifying the moves.
- (4) Coding speech function.
- (5) Interpretation; (i) synoptically, by quantifying overall turns, moves and speech function choices of each speaker; (ii) dynamically, by tracing through the speech function choices as the conversation exchange unfolds (Eggins & Slade, 1997: 215).

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

### **The speech function choices**

In this conversation there are also segments of talk which cannot be assignable because of overlapping and not recordable segment of talk. Not assignable segment of talk because of overlapping done by student can be seen in move 4, while not recordable segment of talk can be seen in nv1.

Table 1 Summary of Speech Function Choices of Conversation I

Speech function	participant		
	ST 1	ST 2	T
<b>Opening:</b>	7	5	
<b>Continuing:</b>	4	7	22
<b>Reacting: responding:</b>	1	16	22
<b>Reacting: rejoinder:</b>	4	11	10
<b>Total</b>	16	39	54

Table 2 Summary of Turns of the Conversation

Participant	Number of Turns	Frequency (%)
Student 1	14	17.72%
Student 2	30	37.98%
foreigner	35	44.30%
Total	79	100%

Table 3 summary or moves of the Conversation

participant	Number of moves	Frequency (%)
Student 1	16	14.68 %
Student 2	39	35.78%
foreigner	54	49.54%
Total	109	100%

**The opening moves** are dominated by the students. First student produces 7 moves and the second student produces 5 moves while the foreigner, he does not produce any of the opening speech functions. It means that all openings (100%) are initiated by the students. The foreigner is dependent on the students' moves. He produces his moves as the reaction toward the student initiation.

As the dominant initiators, the students produce more question of fact. The first student produces 3 questions of fact and the other student also produces 3 questions of fact. It seems that the students want to find out real information about the foreigner, like the country, business, the reason of coming to Yogyakarta and so on. These are the example of opening made by the students which are in form of question of fact:

O: I: question: fact      1      Student1      (i)Where do you come from sir?

The next initiation moves produced by the students are statements of fact. In this moves the students give the introductory information or opinion before they give some questions to invite further information or opinion from the foreigner. Here are the examples of the opening statement:

O: I: statement      33/a      Student1      (i)Mr. Ryan, you have visited many cities, for example Surabaya and Tulung Agung

In the above example, the student does not ask question directly. He starts by stating the fact that the foreigner (Mr Ryan) has visited many cities in Indonesia. From that fact then the student wants to find out whether the tourist figures out the different between Yogya compare to different cities in Indonesia.

**Continuing speech functions** keep negotiating the same proposition produced by the same speaker who has just been talking. Continuing speech functions have two main options; to monitor, to prolong, and to append. (Eggin and Slade, 1997: 195)

In the this conversation, first student produces 4 continuing speech function, the second student produces 7 moves, while the foreigner dominate the continuing speech function by producing 22 moves. It indicates that the foreigner as the dominant one produces 66. 7% from total moves and the rest moves are produced by the student as much as 33.3%.

In this conversation, only a single monitoring move is produced by the student. In this move the student wants to check whether the foreigner is still engage and pay attention to what the student has said. In the example bellow, the student is intended to check whether the foreigner really understand about the factual information of the city of Yogyakarta.

C: monitor      43/a      Student      (i)You know that?



The next is about prolonging moves. Prolonging moves are when the previous speaker adds his/her contribution by giving more information. Here all of the participants produce prolonging moves. In prolonging move the participants try to elaborate, extend and enhance their moves. The first student produces only one prolonging of enhancement, the second student produce five extension, and the foreigner produces four elaboration, seven extensions, and one enhancement.

The next continuing moves produced by the participant are appending. Appending move is mid-way between a continuing: prolonging speech function and a reacting developing move. This move happens when a speaker continues his/her previous move after intervention by another speaker or when a speaker loses his turn, but then when he gets his turn again, he/she continues his/her prior statement. Like prolonging, in appending move the speaker also elaborate, extend or sometimes enhance. This is the example:

- |                   |   |           |  |
|-------------------|---|-----------|--|
| R: resp: answer   | 2 | foreigner | (i)I come from America, California.    |
| R: resp: register | 3 | Student2  | (i)California.                         |
| R: resp: register | 4 | Student1  | (i) California.                        |
| C: app: elaborate | 5 | Student2  | (i)it's well known with fried chicken. |

In the example above, the second student continue her registering move, after the first student's move. Here she elaborate by clarifying that California is well known with fried chicken. On the next example bellow, the foreigner elaborates his prior move after the student having registering move. He verify that importing also means bringing back the products to his country, US.

- |                      |    |           |                                     |
|----------------------|----|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| R: rej: resolve      | 27 | foreigner | (i)==Importing.                     |
| R: resp: register    | 28 | Student2  | (i)Importing.                       |
| C: append: elaborate | 29 | foreigner | (i)Bringing back product to the US. |

The next appending is extending move. In this move the speaker offers additional or contrasting information to his/her prior move after the other speaker's intervention. These are the example:

- |                       |      |           |   |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|---|
| C: prolong: elaborate | 15/b | foreigner | (ii)I've been in Indonesia several times<br>(iii) but never in Yogya.== |
| R: resp: register     | 16   | student2  | (i) ==oh, Indonesia==   |
| C: append: extend     | 17   | foreigner | (iv)==First time in Java actually.                                      |

The last of appending move is appending enhancement. Enhancing means that the speaker is qualifying or giving detail information about his previous move.

Example:

- |                    |      |           |  |
|--------------------|------|-----------|--|
| R: resp: engage    | 23/a | foreigner | (i)Yah.  |
| C: append: extend  | 23/b |           | (ii)For me this time is for business.                    |
| R: resp: register  | 24   | Student2  | (i)Umm ... business.                                     |
| C: append: enhance | 25   | foreigner | (i)So, that's why I'm going to different places of Java. |

**Responding** is reactions which negotiate a proposition or proposal set up by the previous speaker. There are two options of responding; supporting and confronting. Supporting move require response while confronting moves are dispreferred or discretionary responses. Supporting moves are subdivided into developing, engaging, registering, and replying, while confronting are disengaging and replying.

In this Conversation, the first student only produces 1 registering move, and the second student produces 16. It means that the students produce 17 moves or 43.6% from the whole responses, while the foreigner produces higher number of responding moves. He produces 22 moves or 56.4%.

**Developing** move in this conversation is produced only by the second student. Developing moves are moves to respond to previous speaker by expanding what previous speaker has said. Just like continuing move, developing move can be produced by elaborating, extending and enhancing. This example bellow is the developing move produced by the student:

<b>O: I: question: fact</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>Student2</b>	<b>(i)You can speak Indonesian?</b>
R: resp: replay: answer	56	foreigner	(i)Umm ... sedikit.
R: resp: register	57/a	Student2	(i)Ok.
R: develop: elaborate	57/b		(ii)Sedikit dan terima kasih.

The example above show how the students react to the foreigner move by expanding it. Here, the students tries to cooperate by restating what the foreigner has just said.

The next responding move is **registering** move. Registering is a move which encourage other speaker to take another turn. It indicates that the speaker display attention to the speaker and it doesn't introduce new material. In this conversation, the second student produces higher number of registering move. He produces 12 registering move, while the foreigner he produces 5 registering move and the first student only produces 1 move.

R: resp: replay: answer	52	foreigner	(i)Umm ... I'm in Indonesia for six weeks.
R: resp: register	53	Student2	(i)six weeks.

**Replying** move is also belonged to responding move. When a speaker react other speaker's move by replaying, the move can be either supporting or confronting. Supporting is then can be sub divided in to accepting, answering, affirming, complying, agreeing, and acknowledging, while confronting can be done in form of disagreeing, non-complying, withholding, disavowing, and contradicting.

Supporting replying moves are produced by the second student and the foreigner. the student produces 3 moves while the foreigner produces 13 moves.

<b>O: I: question: fact</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Student2</b>	<b>(i)it's your first visit in Yogya?</b>
R: resp: replay: answer	12	foreigner	(i)I've been in Yogya for three days.

The next example is agreeing. in this example, the foreigner respond the student opinion by stating that Yogya is unique. On the other example, the second student give

reaction on the first student's argument, whether the tourist has already know about Yogyakarta, then the second student react by supporting that he is sure that the foreigner know about it.

R: rej: probe	37	Student2	(i)Unique or ...?
R: resp: replay: agree	38/a	foreigner	(i)Ya. Ya (ii)Yogya is definitely unique

Responding confronting replay is only produced by the foreigner. The foreigner produces four moves of confronting replay. The first excerpt bellow is an example of confronting replying. The foreigner in move 49/a indicates that he doesn't know about the conflict between Malaysia and Indonesia. The next example show that the foreigner reacts to the student's prior move, by contradicting as he never in Yogya before.

R: rej: clarify	14/b	student	(ii)And before in Yogya?
R: resp: replay: contradict	15/a	foreigner	(i)No, I've never been in Yogya before ...

In this conversation, the participants only produce **supporting rejoining** moves. The first student produces 1 confirming move and 3 resolving moves. The next student produces 3 clarifying move, 4 probing, 3 resolving and 1 repairing. While the foreigner produces 5 checking moves, 2 confirming, and 3 resolving. So generally, the students produce 15 (58.3%) moves and the foreigner produces 10 moves (41.7%).

Checking moves are produced only by the foreigner. These following moves are the example of tracking:

C: app: elaborate	5	Student2	(i)it's well known with fried chicken.
R: rej: check	6	foreigner	(i)Ya?
R: rej: resolve	7	Student2	(i)California Fried Chicken.
R: rej: check	8	foreigner	(i)Ya?
R: rej: resolve	9	Student1	(i)CFC in Indonesia.
R: resp: register	10	foreigner	(i)Oh.

In the example above in move 6, the foreigner checks the student's opinion about California, and as the result the student produces resolving move (move 7) by providing further explanation about CFC (California Fried Chicken). Checking move usually produced by a speaker because he misheard some elements of prior move. Then the tourist produces checking move to get clear understanding about the student's prior move, so the student restates his prior move in the next resolving move (move 10).

#### **Dynamic interpretation the of Exchanges**

**Exchange 1: move 1-10 (total: 10 moves)** In exchange 1, the students take his turn as the first initiator to open a conversation with the foreigner. The foreigner tries respond by providing the information demanded, and when he doesn't catch or understand about the student's move, he produce many checking moves. It indicates how he respects and attends to the students' initiation.

**Exchange 2: move 12-34 (total: 31 moves)** In exchange 2, the student initiates the exchange by opening a chance for the foreigner to explain his journey in Indonesia. The students indicate their curiosity by producing many registering moves, clarifying move and sometimes probing moves. As the local community, the students show their interest by comparing them with the foreigner who has already traveled through many cities in Indonesia.

**Exchange 3: move 35/a-42/b (total: 15 moves)** The student open a new exchange by restating the previous exchange 2, and then he invite the foreigner's opinion. The foreigner supports the initiation by providing agreeing moves. He supports the students' opinion by continuing his prior moves and he indicates his interest toward traditional values of Indonesia, like batik. Here the foreigner enacts his role as a visitor by giving many supportive compliments toward local values.

**Exchange 5: move 48-52/b (total: 6 moves)** After conducting several negotiation toward local values, the students continues their initiation. In this exchange, rather than providing supportive argument, the foreigner produce disavowal move to deny acknowledgement of prior information. This move then responds by the student by changing the topic immediately.

**Exchange 8: move 63-69 (total: 9 moves)** In this occasion, the student initiates by giving command or merely just request. This request or command can either be supported or confronted by the foreigner depending on the commodity, since there is no pressure implied in the command that the foreigner should give supportive reaction.

#### **Conclusion and suggestion**

From the interaction between students and foreigners in the conversations, most of the openings are produced by the students. The students domination is proved by their production of opening moves, from the whole texts, they dominate the opening moves. It means that the students are good in initiating sequential of talk or they play as the initiators. As the result of the opening moves produced by the students, the foreigners produce many continuing moves and reacting: responding moves. From the whole conversation the foreigners dominate continuing moves by producing from the whole production and they also produce high number of responding moves. It indicates the foreigners respect and enthusiast in interacting with the students.

In communication people should not only concern about the achievement, but they should also concern about the flow of the exchanges. To initiate talks, people can use various mood choices, not only by using interrogative. We can also use statement, command, or offer to initiate talk. To keep the negotiation lasts longer, one could reacts to the prior speaker's move by producing registering moves, or rejoining moves. If we want to get involved in an interaction, we cannot directly interrupt and create new initiation, but we have to wait to be selected by the current speaker or to find the perfect moment to self select without changing the topic being discussed.

## REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. & K.M. Bailey. 1991. *Focus on The Language Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP
- Cohen D, Crabtree B. 2006. *Qualitative Research Guidelines Project*. <http://www.qualres.org/HomeWhat-3513.html> assessed at August, 15, 2009
- Cohen, Louis., Manion, Lawrence. & Morrison, Keith. 2007. *Research Method in Education*. New York: Routledge
- Eggs, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Printer Publisher Ltd.
- Eggs, S. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group
- Eggs, Suzzane and Slade, Diana. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassel
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Langue and Power*. New York: Longman
- Fasold, Ralph. 1990. *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Gerrot, Linda. And Wignell, Peter. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Cammeray: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *Spoken and Written Language*. Victoria: Deakin University Press
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hassan, Ruqaiya. 1985. *Language, Context, and text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotics Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold
- Haslett, Beth. 1987. *Communication, Strategic Action in Context*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Elbaum Associates. <http://books.google.co.id/books?id=IWotMnECyqEC&pg=PA125&lpg=PA125&dq=%22communication,+strategic+action+in+context%22&source=bl&ots=TXDXo5slze&sig=rrY5zLyqHFJ2eEU6cTqVgCe99-o&hl=id>. Accessed at July, 24, 2009
- Hudson, R. A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. London: Cambridge University Press
- Kamişi, Sibel and Dod'ançay-Aktuna, Seran. (2007) *Wiley Interscience*: Effects of social power on language use across speech communities. *International journal of applied linguistics*: vol. 6 issued 2 (pg 199-222) <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119954894/abstract?CRETRY=1&SRETRY=0> accessed at 20<sup>th</sup> May 2010
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

- Martin, J. R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Mathiesen, C. 1995. *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English System*. Tokyo: International Language Science Publisher.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Thompson, Geoff. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. New York: Arnold.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman