

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this chapter, the writer interpreted her analysis to know how to end a conversation when the other party does not want to bring the conversation to a close.

The first finding is about the strategies that are used in ending a conversation. The next finding is about the linguistic signals of those strategies.

4.1 The strategies used to end a conversation

In ending a conversation, PCU students did not merely say goodbye. Strategy is needed even to make a very short ending.

There are three strategies that can be used to end a conversation. Those three kinds of strategies are seen from the variation of closing functions in each strategy. First is the strategy that used four closing functions. The next one is the strategy that used three closing functions. Then, the last is the strategy that used only two closing functions.

For details of strategies used in the conversation between PCU students, can be seen in tables of data 1-9 in Appendix 3. These findings can be summarized in the following:

Table A.

| Conversation→ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Total |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| (1st) Showing no desire to continue the conversation | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | | | √ | √ | 7 |
| (2nd) Asking for an excuse to stop | √ | √ | | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | 8 |
| (3rd) Maintaining good relationship | √ | √ | | | √ | | | √ | | 4 |
| (4th) Keeping future contact | | | | | √ | | √ | | | 2 |
| (5th) Terminating the conversation | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | √ | √ | √ | 8 |
| Variations of strategies | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 29 |

From the above table, it is clear that in all nine conversations, none of the respondents used variations of all five closing functions as a strategy in ending their conversation. It means that speakers can still end their conversation successfully without having to use the whole closing functions offered. In

addition, two closing functions are also enough in making an ending. Those findings explain about the need of strategy in ending a conversation, and that ending is not only exchanging pairs of goodbye.

Strategy consisting of four closing functions:

This strategy is used the most by PCU students to end a conversation. This means that when ending a conversation, they did not just focus on saying goodbye. This can be seen from how they also used other closing functions except terminating the conversation. Conversations that used this strategy of four closing functions have a similarity of having a long closing section, except data 8. Perhaps, the long closing section shows the difficulty in negotiating closings. Long closing sections also can be reflections of the research design to pro-long the conversation. Thus, it demands a strategy that consists of four closing functions. For example:

Data 1.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| (1) Give silent pause | → | 44 B: ((silent)) |
| (1) Use leave-taking behavior | → | ((packing her belongings)) |
| | | 45 A: Opening up until 7 times |
| | | ↓ |
| | | 60 B: |
| (1) Shift position | → | ((stands up)) |
| (5) Give termination marker | → | <i>Dah bye-bye</i> |
| | | 61 A: <i>belum mari ngomong loh, ...</i> (I haven't finished talking ...) |
| (1) Ignore (3) thank | → | 62 B: <i>Trims ya ininya!</i> ((showing the board)) (Thanks for this!) ((showing the ...)) |
| | | 63 A: <i>Sini dhisik! Aku belum mau pulang loh</i> (Stay here! I don't wanna go home yet) |

- (2) Give reason → 64 B: *Trus ya apa? aku wes dijemput*
(So what should i do? I've been picked up)
- 65 A: *Katanya jam dua, ini baru jam ...*
(You said at two o'clock, what time is it? ...)
- (2) Give reason → 66 B: *Nti aku ditinggal loh, ngawur a'e!!*
(They will leave me, screw!)
- 67 A: *Gak ngurus aku, sing ditinggal ...*
(I don't care, it's you that is left behind)
- (5) Take a distance → 68 B: ((walking away))
- 69 A: *Katane aku mau diajak pigi rumahmu?*
(You said you would take me to your house)
- 70 B: *Ayo, cepetan! Tapi ntik kamu tak ...*
(C'mon, hurry up! But i will throw you at...)
- 71 A: *Mbencekno!!*
(Damn you!)
- (5) Give termination marker → 72 B: *Da...dah...*
(Bye...bye...)
- 73 A: *Da...dah...*
(Bye...bye...)
- (5) Give termination marker → 74 B: *Bye...wes ya*
(Bye...see you)

First, just as a remark, the respondent attempted to bring the conversation to an end by showing lack of interest to continue (Silent in turn 44). Then, she showed her readiness to leave (packing her belongings). This shows her negotiation in closing even though her co-participant had not agreed to end. She also tried to ignore her co-participant, but still maintaining good relationship

between them by expressing gratitude (62. *Trims ya ininya*). Moreover, the ending mostly contained excuses for leaving or stopping. By knowing that her partner could not have a conversation alone and that her existence is important for her partner, she was being cooperative in asking for an excuse. However, she was still having difficulties to close the whole conversation. Thus, she chose to use the strongest technique, which is taking a distance until she finally succeeded in ending the conversation.

The strategy in Data 1 is more likely to use non-verbal acts in order to show a lack of enthusiasm in continuing the conversation as well as non-verbal acts that function to terminate the conversation.

The closing functions used in this first strategy are showing no desire to continue, asking or giving an excuse to leave, maintaining good relationship, and terminating the conversation. From four conversations that used this strategy consisting of four closing functions only one conversation that shows a difference choice of closing functions.

Data 5.

17 D: *Mosok seh?* ((SILENT))

Aku kenalno orang mari...

(Really?) ((SILENT))

(Introduce me to someone then)

(1) Ignore (1) Diminish eye contact → 18 G: ((keep reading the newspaper))

19 D: *Kenalno sapa gitu kek..*

(Introduce me to anyone)

opening up 4 times

↓

27 D: *Wes kesel aku suwe-suwe. Mosok nunggu-nunggu terus...sing genah ae yo!...lek menurutmu ya apa? Salah ta aku gitu? Bingung loh....*

(I was tired. Do i have to keep waiting...no kidding!...what do you

think? Am i wrong? This is
confusing...)

- (1) Ignore (1) Diminish eye contact → **28 G:** ((Looking at the clock))
- (3) Use phatic talk → *Aduh!!! Sekarang wes jam piro, rek?*
Wuih, wes jam tujuh!
(Damn!!! What time is it now? What,
it's seven now!)
- (2) Give reason → *Gendeng, aku belom mandi yo!*
(Crazy me, I haven't taken a bath
yet)
- (3) Use phatic talk → *Panas loh dina iki. Panas gak
menurutmu?? Puanas yo!!!*
(It's god damn hot today. Don't you
think so? It's really HOT!)
- (2) Dismiss oneself → *Wes aku adhus sek yo!!*
(OK, then, I'm going to take a bath
now, ok!!)
- 29 D:** *Tapi, lek...*
(But if...)
- 30 G:** *Aku gak isa mikir lek aku kepanasan*
(I can't think if i feel hot)
- 31 D:** *Gimana lek de'e malah musuhin aku
gara-gara ini? Aku kan maksudne
bukan pingin musuhin de'e, cuma...*
(How if he hate me because of this? I
don't mean to hate him, just...)
- (2) Give reason → **32 G:** *Percuma kon ngomong, aku wes gak
isa mikir,*
(It useless to say it, i can't think right
now,)
- (2) Dismiss oneself → *wes ya aku adhus sek!*

- (i wanna take a bath!)
- (4) Make arrangement → *Lek mo ngomong besok ae,*
(If you still want to talk, tommorow ok,)
- (2) Give reason → *mari gini aku mo ngerjakno tugas,*
tugasku akeh
(I'm going to do my assignment after this, I have alot of assignments)
- 33 D: *Ya wes..besok ae, thanks ya*
(Ok then...Tomorrow, thanks)
- (3) Apology → 34 G: *Sori loh...*
(I'm sorry)
- 35 D: *Gak pa-pa*
(It's ok)

A long closing section in Data 5. also shows the difficulty in ending a conversation. However, the second speaker in Data 5 (G) did not use the same closing functions as in Data 1,2, and 8. This conversation did not end with terminating function. G used apology to end the conversation and terminating was absent. The terminating function was absent because of the setting of this conversation. In Data 5 the setting was in boarding house. The conversation happened between housemates. It is rationable, then, to end a conversation without giving any termination markers, or well-wishes. Both speakers ended the conversation, but they did not really leave the other because they stay in the same place. They might consider terminating as unnecessary for they would still meet. Using termination in this conversation could be thought as if the speaker was sending away their addressee. Making arrangement in the conversation above shows the cooperation of the second speaker or the respondent. She did not want to continue the conversation at that time, but she offered the compensation to continue the conversation on the next day. This arrangement was made because her previous closing negotiations failed in ending the conversation, which

strengthen the idea that difficult ending needs more closing functions in strategy of ending a conversation.

Data 8 is the only conversation that has a very short closing section. However, the fact that this conversation also used strategy consisting of four closing functions is interesting. It does not show any difficulty in ending the conversation. In fact, the respondent only needed two turns to accomplish her closing. The research design to pro-long the conversation, then, is proved not influenced this conversation.

Data 8

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | 17 C: <i>Baru satu, //soalnya gak sempet</i> (Only one, // don't have time) |
| (1) Diminish eye contact | → | 18 L: <i>//((Looking at her watch and get shocked)) NGAWUR!! (DAMN!!)</i> |
| (2) Give reason | → | <i>Aku kudu mulih...</i> (I must go home...) |
| (1) Give pre-closing expres. | → | <i>wes yah!</i> (see you) |
| (5) Take a distance | → | <i>((walking away))</i> |
| | | 19 C: <i>Hey...!</i> (Hey...!) |
| (3) Apology | → | 20 L: <i>Sori...</i> (Sorry) |
| (5) Give termination marker | → | <i>dah yah!</i> (Bye) |

Data 8 shows a short closing section, but the respondent still tried to use as many as closing functions in her strategy of ending the conversation. In addition, she chose to maintain a good relationship by apologizing to her addressee before she really terminated the conversation. Besides, "L" must have a strong reason to leave, seeing how she got shocked after looking at her watch. Even if this expression is also part of her strategy, at least, she tried to show that she had strong reason to leave immediately. By combining three closing functions in one

turn, L tried to force a closing as if she was also being cooperative that made C could not open a new topic to pro-long the conversation.

Thus, using the strategy consisting of four closing functions may show difficulties in ending a conversation. Nevertheless it can be an effective strategy to end a conversation if it is used together in one or two turns.

Strategy consisting of three closing functions

This strategy shows that in ending a conversation, the focus is not in maintaining good relationship and keeping future contact. It stresses more in showing the respondent's unwillingness to continue the conversation. As a result, the respondent was signaling her readiness to end the conversation and also giving reason as an excuse to stop.

As an example is Data 4.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | 8 F: <i>Wong bapak'e itu rodo ngono...</i> (He's a little bit...that.....) |
| (1) Give silent pause | → | ((<u>silent</u>)) |
| (1) Shift position | → | ((stand up)) |
| (2) Dismiss oneself | → | <i>Wes yah aku tak masuk,</i> (seeyou...I'll get in to the class) |
| (5) Give termination marker | → | <i>da...dah...</i> (Bye bye) |
| | | 9 C: <i>Loh...loh...apa sih? Baru jam berapa?</i> (Heh...heh...what do you mean? What time is it?) |
| (2) Give reason | → | 10 F: <i>Aku iki ben masuk telat, metune paling cepet. Bapak'e gurung metu aku ...</i> (I often come late, get out soon. I even have already got out before the teacher) |
| | | 11 C: Opening up of 9 moves |

- ↓
- 21 C: ...*printernya ya tak bawa kosku*
boleh?
(may I bring your printer to my
boarding house?)
- (1) Give pre-closing expres. → 22 F: *Ojo!!...wes ya!!!*
(No!!...see you!!!)
- (1) Shift position → ((stand up))
- 23 C: Opening up of 3 moves
↓
- (1) Give pre-closing expres. → 28 F: *Enak aja, punyaku yo...wes yah ...*
(Dare you, it's mine..., see you)
- (2) Dismiss oneself → *naek*
(going upstairs)
- (5) Take a distance → ((walking away))
- 29 C: *He-eh*
(Ok)
- (5) Give termination marker → 30 F: *Da...dah*
(Bye bye)

It can be that F was actually maintaining good relationship, but she did it implicitly. She did not use any of polite phrases or phatic talk. However, she had pro-long the conversation twice (turn 12-22, and 24-28) since her first closing initiation. This can also show her cooperative attitude in maintaining relationship while trying to negotiate closings.

Therefore, when people use strategy that does not contain a function of maintaining good relationship, it does not always mean that those people do not care about their relationship.

Another interesting finding to show that using strategy with only three closing functions still concerns on maintaining good relationship can be seen in the following example

Data 7.

- (2) Give reason → 2 S: *Iya tapi minggu lalu wes telat aku,*

sungkan lho!!

(Yup, but I was late last week. I feel ashamed now)

3 D: Opening up of 4 moves

↓

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| (2) Dismiss oneself | → | <p>12 S: ((laughing)) <i>gak lah. <u>Ayo rek!</u></i> (Not like that. <u>C'mon guys!</u>)</p> <p>13 D: <i>Liat'o filmne! Leslie Cheung loh.</i> (See the movie! Leslie Cheung)</p> |
| (2) Dismiss oneself | → | <p>14 S: <i>Iya iya. <u>Yuk ah!</u></i> (Yeah yeah. <u>See you!</u>)</p> |
| (5) Give termination marker | → | <p>((walk away))</p> <p>15 D: <i>Lho, ...!!</i> (Hey)</p> |
| (4) Making arrangement | → | <p>16 S: <i><u>Besok ya, besok ae</u> mari telaah puisi</i> <i>aku kan nganggur atau setelah ...</i> (Tomorrow ok, tomorrow after Telaah puisi I'll have a spare time, or after Stylistics.)</p> <p>17 D: <i>Sebelumnya stylistics ya</i> (Before stylistics, ok?)</p> |
| (5) Give termination marker | → | <p>18 S: <i>Iya...dah!</i> (Yeah...bye!)</p> |

Keeping future contact in the above data can also function as maintaining good relationship because the function of the utterance does not only to keep a future contact but also to compensate the conversation at that moment with another conversation in the future. The conversation in Data 7 can be considered as a short conversation. The speakers only talked about one topic that had not finished yet. Perhaps, because of this reason, the respondent offered a compensation to have another conversation on the day after. The fact that a reason for stopping had been given in the very beginning of the conversation shows the inability of the respondent to provide time for that conversation. Her

compensation, then, could be interpreted as her good will in maintaining both speakers relationship.

Strategy consisting of two closing functions

To end a conversation, using a strategy that only has two closing functions is possible and tolerable. However, this is not a preferable strategy for only two conversations that used this strategy. In this analysis, there are two kinds of strategy with two closing functions. First strategy combines showing no desire to continue a conversation with terminating the conversation. The other one is combining asking for an excuse to stop the conversation with terminating the conversation.

It appears that using only two closing functions as a strategy to end a conversation is quite acceptable. Like in Data 3:

- (1) Give pre-closing expres. →
- 8 E: *Wes ta lha, lu ojo ngomong terus!!*
(Just stop talking, would you!)
 - 9 A: *Ya apa entik aku diseneni lagi.....*
(I would be scolded again...)
 - 10 E: *Lu kan mo ngerjain semling toh?*
(You wanted to work on your seminar, right?)
 - 11 A: *Iya sih. Aku emang rencananya gitu tapi ga jadi*
(Yes, that's the plan. I planned to but i didn't (do it).)
 - 12 E: *Ya wes ngomong ae lu kerja semling*
(Then, just say you worked on your seminar)
 - 13 A: *Heuh, bohong lagi?*
(Heh, lying again)
 - 14 E: *Abis gitu lu keluar kamare de'e lu ngomong dewe "tapi gak jadi"*

- (After that, you walk out of her room and say to yourself “but i didn’t”)
- 15 A: *Gombalmu!!!!*
(What a crab!!!)
- (1) Give pre-closing expres. → 16 E: *Dah, wes ngecepret ae*
(Finish, (you) just babbling)
- 17 A: *Trus kon ini gendeng tah? Kon ojo ngomong...*
(Then you must be crazy, you can’t say...)
- (5) Give termination marker → 18 E: *Wes ya da...dah...!!!*
(Right, yeah...yeah..., bye...bye..)
- (1) Shift position → ((standing up
(5) Take a distanec → and walking away))
- 19 A: *HEH!!*
(Heh!!)
- 20 E: *Apa?*
(What?)
- 21 A: *Ngomong durung mari ditinggal-tinggal!!*
(Leaving while I haven’t finished talking!)
- (1) Give pre-closing expres. → 22 E: *Wes.., apa lagi?? Oya, liat hpmu warna apa?* ((coming back again))
(You have.., what else? O yeah, may I see your handphone, what is the colour?)
- 23 A: *Gak ada, transparan. Belom mari lho!!*
(No colour, transparant. I haven’t finished yet)

- (5) Give termination marker → **24 E:** *Wes lah....*((walking away))
(See you)

In the above example, the respondent did not even give reason, dismiss herself or dismiss the other speaker. Moreover, the respondent gave too many pre-closing expression instead of giving reason. The writer assumed that the pre-closing expression given could function as an excuse for stopping. When “E” used pre-closing expression, she did not just show her unwillingness to continue the conversation, but also asking the other speaker whether it was the right time to stop the conversation or the other speaker still had something else to talk about. Perhaps the respondent really did not have any reason to stop the conversation. In addition, she was not required to provide any explaining of her leaving.

It will be different in situation where the addressee is questioning their leaving, like the example below.

Data 6.

- (2) Dismiss oneself → **30 H:** *Eh, iya, tak tinggal sek yah*
(Eh, well, I’m leaving now)
- 31 C:** *Loh, pegi ta?*
(You’ll leave?)
- (2) Dismiss oneself → **32 H:** *Iya, pegi dulu yah!*
(Yup, I’m leaaving)
- 33 C:** *Loh aku?*
(and me?)
- 34 H:** *Kamu kan masih nunggu Pak (name) toh?*
(You still have to wait Mr. (name) right?)
- 35 C:** *Iya sih, tapi kan...*
(yeah, but...)
- (5) Take a distanec → **36 H:** *Ya udah tunggu aja! ((walking away))*
(Then just wait!)

- 37 C: *Loh..., pegi mana?*
(Hey...where are you going?)
- (2) Give reason → 38 H: *Ke puskom, mau internet*
(Compute lab, wanna online)
- 40 C: *Terus aku ditinggal?*
(then you'll leave me?)
- (2) Give reason → 41 H: *He..he..iya..udah siang soalnya,*
nanti keburu penuh.
(He..he..yup..it's noon already, it will full)
- (5) Give termination marker → *Da...dah...!!*
(bye...bye...!)
- 42 C: *Da dah*
(Bye bye)

In this conversation C (turn 31, 37, and 40) was asking why H was leaving. Thus, H must provide an answer. By providing answers to C's question, H can be said had cooperatively negotiate her closing.

In other words, the strategy consisting of two closing functions is also effective in ending a conversation and can still show cooperative closing negotiation.

The findings tell that from nine open role-play conversation that had been analyzed, the strategy that is used in each conversation consisting of at least two closing functions. It means that speakers did not close their conversation by directly terminated the conversation using any of termination markers or taking a distance.

Bringing a conversation to an end is proved to be not simply a matter of saying goodbye. There has to be at least other closing function that does not straightforwardly terminate the conversation. In other words, before terminating the conversation, speakers should give any of closing functions that can either show cooperative attitude (avoid of being rude to the others) or maintaining relationship between both speakers. Although using strategy consisting two

closing functions is acceptable, speakers tend to use strategy of four or three closing functions. This strengthens the concept of conversation as a cooperative activity.

4.2 Most closing functions that is used in strategies to end a conversation

Before determining the most closing function used in strategies to end a conversation, there is important presumption to ignore terminating a conversation as the mostly used closing function. The main reason is because it is like a routine that when a conversation is really terminated, people use this closing function to do so. Thus, this closing function must appear in almost all conversations.

From table A, asking for or giving an excuse especially by giving reason is used in almost all strategies in ending a conversation. For examples:

Data 1. **64** B: *Trus ya apa? aku wes dijemput*

(So what now? I've been picked up)

66 B: *Nti aku ditinggal loh, ngawur a'e!!*

(I'll be left behind, screw!!)

Data 2. **56** N: *Ya wes ya!...yah!...pergi perpustakaan!*

(well see you!...Ok!...I'll go to library)

Data 6. **38** H: *Ke puskom, mau internet*

(To Computer lab, wanna online)

Data 7. **2** S: *Iya tapi minggu lalu wes telat aku, sungkan lho!!*

(yeah, but I was late last week, I feel ashamed now!!)

Some respondents chose to dismiss themselves from the conversation. For example:

Data 6. **30** H: *Eh, iya, tak tinggal sek yah*

(Eh, well, I'm leaving ok)

Data 4. **8** F: *... Wes yah aku tak masuk, da...dah...*

(... see you, I'm going in, bye bye ...)

Apparently, this closing function is important in ending a conversation. It provides reason or at least justification of the end of the conversation. Hence, when the speaker stops or leaves the conversation, the other speaker does not get confused and misunderstood.

The preferable way to ask for an excuse is by giving reason followed by dismissing oneself. Only in one conversation dismissing the other speaker is used.

Data 2. **84** N: ((looking at her watch)) *Jam piro iki? Jam dua loh,*
kon gak melo pigi perpus ta?
 (What time is it? It's two o'clock, don't you want to go to library?)

Dismissing the other speaker is probably considered not a cooperative way for ending a conversation. All the conversations were started by the informants, and the respondents are those who supposed to end them. For this reason, the respondents felt that they might offend their addressee if they forced a closing by dismissing them.

Besides, asking for an excuse, showing no desire to continue a conversation is also used almost as many as the former.

The fact that the respondents preferred to begin their negotiation of ending by showing no desire to continue the conversation is shown in the above table A.

Data 1.

43 A: *Gak pa-pa. Menembus batas ini.*
"Menembus Batas" sinetron baru.
 (It's ok, beyond the limit. "Beyond the Limit" a new soap opera title)

Give silent pause → **44** B: ((silent))
 Use leave-taking behavior → ((packing her belongings))

Data 2.

52 N: *Ngono Mam (name)?*
 (Why should Ms. (name)?)

53 A: *Iyo...*
 (Yeah..)

Give silent pause → **54** N: *Ehm...*
 (Uhm...)

55 A: *Kok meneng ae?*
 (Why so quiet?)

By showing no desire or less desire to continue the conversation, the speakers tried to make their addressee understand they did not want to talk anymore and want to inform that it was time to close the conversation.

Only in data 6 and data 7, the respondent directly negotiated her closing by using 2nd closing function that is dismissing herself from the conversation or giving reason to stop the conversation.

Data 7.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---|
| | | 1 D: <i>Heh, sinio duduk!! Wes lama loh gak bercengkrama</i> (Heh, please sit down!! It's been long time not chatting) |
| Give reason | → | 2 S: <i>Iya tapi minggu lalu wes telat aku, sungkan lho!!</i> Yeah, but I was late last week, I feel ashame now) |
| | | 3 D: <i>Ada kelas ta?</i> (Have a class?) |

This happened perhaps because the respondent was really in hurry to leave the conversation that she did not have enough time for expressing her lack of interest in having the conversation. In Data 7, S had asked for an excuse at the very beginning of the conversation (turn 2). Thus, she did not need to express her lack of desire to continue the conversation. She believed it was quite acceptable to terminate the conversation at any time for she had provided a reason to do so.

Maintaining good relationship, actually, is not too significant in its function as to end a conversation. However, the speakers cannot just abandon it because the ending of a conversation is not the ending of the relationship between the speakers. Thus, maintaining good relationship while ending a conversation is one strategy in maintaining the speakers' relationship. Nevertheless, the findings illustrate only five respondents that pay attention on maintaining good relationship while they were ending their conversation. In data 1 (uttrc. 62), the respondent thanked the addressee before she terminated the whole conversation. Apology is used by respondents in Data 5 (uttrc. 34) and Data 8 (uttrc. 20) as a

regret because they could not continue the conversation. The rest strategy in maintaining good relationship deals with phatic talk. However, phatic talk in Data 2 (uttrc. 84) and Data 5 (uttrc. 28) is more likely about reminding of the time to leave. It did not function as a question because actually the speakers had known about the time (they had seen their watch or the clock before uttered the phatic talk).

Data 5 28 G: *Aduh!!! Sekarang wes jam piro, rek? Wuih, wes jam tujuh!*

(Damn!!! What time is it now? Wouw, it's seven already)

Data 2 84 N: *Jam piro iki? Jam dua loh, ...*

(What time is it? It's two o'clock)

One interesting phatic talk in Data 5 (uttrc. 84) concerns on the weather of that day. "Panas loh dina iki. Panas gak menurutmu?? Puanas yo!!!" This phatic talk can be uttered in a more direct way that is the speaker wants to stop the conversation because she wants to take a bath. Nevertheless, the respondent used phatic talk rather than asking an excuse to stop the conversation. In this case, she tried to maintain her relationship with her addressee by saying more polite phrases (phatic talk are part of polite phrases).

Some respondents consider keeping future contact as an additional part of the strategy in ending a conversation. From nine conversations that the writer analyzed, only in two conversations the respondents made reference or arrangement for future contact.

Data 5. 32 G: *... Lek mo ngomong besok ae ...*

(... If you want to talk, tomorrow ok ...)

Data 7. 16 S: *... Besok ya, besok ae mari telaah puisi aku kan ...*

(... Tomorrow ok, after poetry I have ...)

The arrangement made in Data 5 and Data 7 concerned on the continuing of the conversation. Because the respondents could not pro-long the conversation, they offered a compensation in the future to keep the contact between the speakers.

Although most respondents used termination markers and taking-leave to terminate their conversation, the writer cannot categorize them as the most chosen

strategy because they are more routine-like. Almost every conversation ended with termination markers. This does not influence the strategy of ending a conversation since most speakers must have agreed to close their conversations before the termination markers are given. The use of termination markers is just merely a habit. However, this strategy can be said as an effective strategy because in most data, after the initiation of this strategy, the other speakers usually could only make few opening up. Taking a distance is the strongest one in forcing a closing. After the respondents negotiate this act, their addressee could not open another new topic and finally agree to end the conversation. The perfect example is from Data 8.

- 18 L:** ((Looking at her watch and get shocked)) *NGAWUR!! Aku kudu mulih...wes yah!* ((walking away))
 ((Looking at her watch)) (NGAWUR!! I have to go home...see you!)((walking away))
- 19 C:** *Hey...!*
 (hey...!)
- 20 L:** *Sori...dah yah!*
 (Sorry...bye now!)

Walking away is an example of taking a distance or part of terminating the conversation. C was supposed to pro-long the conversation of about threre times when L wanted to end it. However, in this case, C could not even initiate another move after L initiate the closing by taking a distance.

The same situation also happened in Data 4. After the respondent F was taking a distance, C did not have any choice but to agree with the closing negotiation.

- 28 F:** *Enak aja, punyaku yo...wes yah ...naek* ((walking away))
 (Dare you, It's mine...see you...I'm going up)
- 29 C:** *He-eh*
 (He-eh)
- 30 F:** *Da...dah*
 (bye...bye)

In ending a conversation, terminating is used almost in all final stage of the conversation. However, the most important and preferable closing function that can be used as strategy in ending a conversation is asking for an excuse to stop.

4.3 Linguistic signals of the strategies

According to Wardhaugh (1985), linguistics signals of negotiating a closing can be in form of verbal and non-verbal signals. Non-verbal signals appeared in diminishing eye contact, shifting position, leave-taking behavior, and in taking a distance. Meanwhile, verbal signals are all the utterances of the speakers that can function to negotiate the closings.

In this analysis, the writer excluded the non-verbal signals, and discussed only the linguistic signals (verbal signals).

Pre-closing expression signals

The most interesting signals to be analyzed is pre-closing expression signals. If Goffman mentioned pre-closing signals as “well”, “ok”, “right.” The signals in bahasa Indonesia also show similarity. Most pre-closing signals in the conversation that the writer observed consist of word “wes” and “yah”.

For example: Data 2. 56 N: *Ya wes ya!...yah!...pergi perpustakaan!*

(Ok, see you!...Ok!...going to the library!)

88 N: *Wes ya...aku tak pergi perpustakaan dhisik ya...melo gak?*

(See you...I'm going to the library...coming?)

Data 3.8 E: *Wes ta lha*

(Just stop)

18 E: *Wes ya da...dah...!!!*

(See you bye bye!!!)

22 E: *Wes.., apa lagi??*

(finish...what else?)

Data 4.8 F: *Wong bapak'e itu rodo ngono...((silent))*

((stand up)) *Wes yah aku tak masuk, da...dah...*

(He's a little bit...that...see you...I'll get in to the class...bye...bye...)

22 F: *Ojo!!...wes ya!!!* ((stand up))

(No!!...see you!!!)

Data 9.16 R: *Iya,.....wes ya!*

(Right...see you!)

All the above pre-closing signals, serve the same function to ask whether the other speaker is ready to close the conversation. Whether they appear in the single-word signal type or two-word signal, it does not influence the meaning nor the function.

Asking for an excuse signals

Other signals that can be analyzed are signals for asking an excuse to stop or leave the conversation. The signals for asking an excuse usually appeared with word “*pergi*”, “*pigi*”, “*mulih*”.

For example: Data 2 56 N: *Ya wes ya!...yah!...pergi perpustakaan!*

Right see you! ...Ok!...Going to library!)

60 N: *Tak **pergi** dhisik*

(I’m going first)

88 N: *Wes ya...aku tak pergi perpustakaan dhisik ya...melo gak?*

(See you...I’m going to the library...coming?)

Data 6.32 H: *Iya, pegi dulu yah!*

(Yup, I’m going!)

Data 8. 18 L: *//((Looking at her watch and get shocked))*

NGAWUR!! Aku kudu mulih...wes yah! ((walking away))

(DAMN!! I must go home....see you!)

Data 9.18 R: ***Mulih** aku*

(I’m going home)

Thus, this finding is similar to type of idiomatic signals “the excuse.” In the excuse, Stockwell proposed signals that contain at least a word “go”. The above example, especially the words in bold are all have the same meaning with “go”. The difference of “pergi”, “pegi”, and “pigi” is just a matter of pronouncing influenced by local dialect. The word “mulih” is a javanese word for “go home.”

Asking an excuse can be done by giving reason, and some signals in giving reason have a similarity. It turns out that when people give reason for

stopping a conversation, they favor to mention about condition that have consequences.

For example: Data 1. **66** B: *Nti aku ditinggal loh, ngawur a'e!!*

(I'll be left behind, screw!)

Data 6. **41** H: *He..he..iya..udah siang soalnya, nanti keburu penuh.*

(He..he..yeah...it's noon already, it will full)

Data 7. **2** S: *Iya tapi minggu lalu wes telat aku, sungkan lho!!*

(Yes, but I was late last wee, I feel ashamed now)

The only logical way to explain these phenomena is perhaps because mentioning the consequences can stronger the reason they make. Then, their co-participant will accept their negotiation of closing.

Phatic talk signals

In using phatic talk, most respondents deal with giving rhetoric question that function to remind about the time.

For example: Data 2. **84** N: ((looking at her watch)) *Jam piro iki? Jam dua loh,*

kon gak melo pigi perpus ta?

((looking at her watch)) (what time is it? It's two o'clock, don't you want to go to library?)

Data 5. **28** G: ((Looking at the clock)) *Aduh!!! Sekarang wes jam*

piro, rek? Wuih, wes jam tujuh! ...

((Looking at the clock)) (Damn!!! What time is it now? Wouw, it's seven already)

Those are rhetoric question because both speakers had looked their watch or clock and known about the time. They use this kind of signals to remind the time to end a conversation in a more polite way.

In types of idiomatic signals offered by Stockwell, phatic talk usually concerned with the future-phatic, like *have a nice weekend, hope it goes well*. In this research, however, phatic talk does not appear in the same way.

Making reference signals

Only two signals for making reference that is used in this research. Both signals mention about the time in the future to continue the conversation.

For example: Data 5.32 G: *Percuma kon ngomong, aku wes gak isa mikir, wes Ya aku adhus sek! Lek mo ngomong besok ae, mari gini aku mo ngerjakno tugas, tugasku akeh*
 (It useless to say it, i can't think right now, i wanna take a bath! If you still want to talk, tommorow ok, I'm going to do my assignment after this, I have alot of assignments)

Data 7.16 S: *Besok ya, besok ae mari telaah puisi aku kan nganggur atau setelah stylistic itu*
 (Tomorrow, tomorrow ok after poetry I have a spare time or after Stylistics)

These signals of making reference can be categorized to the rendezvous strategy signals. The indicator for this signal is the appearance of specific time somewhere in the future for another contact between the speakers.

Terminating signals

Terminating signals are very much the same as pair of “goodbye”. Interestingly, the finding of terminating signals shows that English language is also used as a termination in conversations that supposed to use bahasa Indonesia.

For example: Data 1.60 B: ... ((stands up)) *Dah **bye-bye***

74 B: ***Bye**...wes ya...*

Nevertheless, the most common signal for terminating in these conversations is “*da...dah*” or simply “*dah*.” This signal is used in almost every conversation, such as in Data 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Hence, a pair of “*da dah*” functions the same as a pair of “goodbye.”