

which the Bearer displays support of and endorses the teller's conveyed stance (Stivers, 2007, p. 10). If affiliation is done through agreements or upgrades of statements made by the speaker, they show understanding and agreement with the speaker's stance (Long & Crofford, 2001, p. 16). If affiliation is expected and preferred, the audience can choose to resist the point of the story and display disaffiliation through various dispreferred forms. One way to identify disaffiliation is by its format, as disaffiliative remarks are usually produced in a dispreferred format that includes delay, mitigation, or accounts (Crofford, 2004, p. 11). Delay refers to how disaffiliative responses are often delayed, which means there is a notable pause before the listeners respond. Mitigation refers to the various efforts speakers make to reduce the negative impact of their disaffiliation. This is shown through hedging or agreement prefaces. On the other hand, accounts refer to remarks that act as reasoning for the disaffiliative response given. Although alignment and affiliation are important aspects of conversation to be researched, this paper will be focusing on disaffiliation in this paper.

Within a conversation, participants may use various interactional practices to display disaffiliation. The topic of disaffiliation was explored in Crofford's (2004) study of non-prefaced utterances (FPU), a practice employed to show disaffiliation. Although disaffiliative responses are often begun with an agreement preface (Long & Crofford, 2001, p. 16), other forms

encounter, the female client and counselor both disaffiliated with the male client by directly addressing his disaffiliation. However, this resulted in a new affiliation between the female client and counselor, sharing a mutual disaffiliation against the male client. As a result, the male client subsequently exercised the practice of withdrawing and disengaging further from the interaction and topic to show continued disaffiliation.

Also focusing on forms of disaffiliation, Gu et al. (2015) study focused on analyzing the management of disaffiliation between romantic heterosexual partners in Mandarin. Gu et al. (2015)

\$'cerpt 47 Karlic hicken

[Clip 0091 \(00:40-01:39\)](#)

01 War: yeah=
 02 =>it's not-< (.) it's not li e !:a=
 03 =>"yo# no\$ (ho\$) li e-%<
 04 (0.9)
 0& War: 'arli((hi(en ri'ht)=
 0* =yo# "thin o+ !:a-
 0, !a o"ne (.) \$here y:o# (.) yo# a(t#ally (r"#st i::t%
 0- an! there's li e that sa#(e an! its (r#n"(hy
 09 (.)
 10 War: ri'ht)
 11 (2.0)
 12 .oe: ((ya\$ns))
 13 /hy: </0::re.>
 14 (2.&)
 1& /hy: >1 !on't no\$.<
 1* (3.&)
 1, War: >it's li- it's li e< th:e- the s\$:eet 'arli(so:y (.) in!a
 1- "sa#(e% (.) instea! o:+ (.) li e >i- i- it's 2#st li e<
 19 (1.-)
 20 War: they 3a!e- (.) 4ar4e5#e (hi(en%
 2 4#t they 2#st p#t- (ho e 'arli(
 22 /hy: " 6:7% yeah% that's 8typi(al.
 23 War: 8yeah yeah ye
 24 (2.0)
 2& War: >4#t "li e< i+ 1 or!er +ro3 li e the other ell an ell (9:9) li e
 2* Waipah# they a(t#ally 3a e it (orre(tly \$here it's a(t#ally li e
 2, +rie! (hi(en \$ith the 'arli(soy sa#(e)
 2- /hy: ;h3.;
 29 War: ;it's so \$eir!.;
 30 /hy: 1 thin they 2#st all ha<e their o\$ n 3etho!s.
 31 (4.0)
 32 /hy: 1 'ot the (hi(en- the 4ar4e5#e (hi(en plate +ro3 ell an ell
 33 (9:9) to!ay%

Through lines 4%, (ar attempts to get the other participants to validate his complaint&assessment of the garlic chicken. ,n lines ? and 4. , he asks for confirmation from the others that they agree with his assessment. The preferred answer to the +uestion in line / would be an affirmative one, one that is produced immediately. However, the pauses in lines 44, 41, and 4= show 3oe and Shy&s disaffiliation "(ong E (aring, -. -.#. 3oe does not respond at all, which may be a sign of disinterest in the current topic, thus, disaffiliating "Selting, -. 46#. ,n addition, Shy&s responses in lines 40 and 4? may be preferred in terms of content, but they are dispreferred in how they are performed. ,n line 40, Shy&s response is lengthened in a slow tempo, showing reluctance and possibly doubt "(ong E (aring, -. -.#. The recipients do not verbally>e they agree in any way, which e'hibits their lack of affiliation. This is displayed further by Shy&s continued response in line 4?, as she responds to (ar&s solicitation right? with, I on. know, a non%committal response "@untigl, -. 40#.

,n the beginning of line 46, (ar&s response provides evidence that there is disaffiliation by the recipients. He +uickly stammers as he pursues the current topic with further descriptions of the garlic chicken "Selting, -. 46#. ! lthough some may argue that Shy and 3oe gave dispreferred answers because they did not yet understand his point, this does not seem to be the case. ,n line --, Shy acknowledges

(Car's point with the change-of-state token B) 7H,D showing recognition, followed by a clear disagreement "Heritage, 45/1#. Her choice of the word *typi ál*, used to assess the garlic chicken, contrasts with (Car's point that the garlic chicken he ordered was unusual "@untigl, -. 40#.

,n lines -?%-6, (Car continues to pursue this topic, perhaps to solicit a preferred answer. However, in line -/, Shy's minimal token again shows disaffiliation. This was perhaps done to terminate the topic "Selting, -. 46#. ,n line -5, (Car stops trying to solicit agreement and, with a final upgraded strong assessment token, terminates the topic this turn "Selting, -. 46#. ,n line 0. , Shy attempts to diffuse the disagreement by giving a softer hedge with a less-confrontational statement. By choosing to resolve the disagreement by making a non-accusatory statement, this disaffiliation does not show that she agrees with (Car's perspective nor continuous solicitation of agreement in lines ? and 4. "(ong E (aring, -. -. #.

,n this excerpt, the practice of delayed and absent responses is used repeatedly, particularly

2* (1.0)
 2, War: >i !on- i< !on't really li e the sa+e\$ay ones they in!a har!.
 2- (4.0)
 29 /hy: i !on't eat any o+ the3.
 30 .oe: hh hh
 31 /hy: "i li e the ones +ro3 alapa\$a:i%
 32 they ha<e li e the sea salt on top o+ their (ho(olate (hip (oo ies
 33 .hhh h::o <that's the 4e:st.>
 34 (1.0)
 3& War: that's an <interestin' (o34ination>.
 3* /hy: ">\$hat !o yo# 3ean%<=
 3, =itBs li e eatin' sea salt \$ith (ara3el an! (ho(olate%
 3- 4#t li e its (oo ies.
 39 (2.&)
 40 War: <i'<e ne<<:a (.) ecperien(e! that>.

03 /hy: 4#t any\$ays%
 04 (1.0)
 0& /hy: it \$as s#("ess+#l
 0* .hhh an! then he (a3e 4a(
 0, .hh (.) an! 'a<e 3:e "(o(o p#++s +ro:3 liliha 4a ery.
 0- .oe: s"ee h8e ne\$= \$ho (.) ho\$ har! yo# \$or e!.
 09 /hy: 8yay=
 10 (2.0)
 11 /hy: ;i '#ess; s:o.
 12 (&.-)
 13 /hy: 4#t that \$as it.
 14 (4.0)
 1& /hy: ;nothin' too; e<ent+#l. 4esi!es that.
 1* .oe: i 3ean%
 1, (1.0)
 1- .oe: \$e are on la(- lo:::(- !o\$n.
 19 (2.0)
 20 /hy: yea:h%
 21 (3.0)
 22 /hy: >4#t "li e-< yo# (an still !o st#++%
 23 (1.0)
 24 /hy: yo# no\$)
 2& (1.0)
 2* .oe: tr#e.
 2, (4.0)
 2- .oe: .hh tr::#e.

(hen 3oe responds to Shy's story in lines 4= and 4/, he affiliates with Shy by +uickly responding and with a possible e' planation for why nothing too e<ent \$ happened, according to Shy. ,n the delays in lines 45, -4, and -0, Shy shows her hesitation, which is a form of disaffiliation "(of PEP is a@@ng UrbPser heTy h09

a dispreferred format, which may signify the difference in her level of attachment/connection to these participants. She may not feel as amiable towards (Car) as she does towards Joe, as evidenced by the fact that she does not take any opportunity to affiliate with (Car). At the same time (Car) most often attempts to still solicit affiliation even after Shy's disaffiliation. This shows that (Car) may feel positive towards Shy, despite Shy not reciprocating. Also, with Shy's consistent disaffiliation in excerpt 1, (Car)'s disaffiliation may be a direct response to Shy's disaffiliation. (Car) is not necessarily disaffiliating with Shy's statement but with Shy herself. This is consistent with my knowledge as a member of this community.

Considering the small number of analyzed cases, further research needs to be done until a proper conclusion can be reached and generalized. Also, the analysis begs the questions of how other participants react in the event of a disaffiliative response, and how their responses differ based on whether the disaffiliation was produced in a dispreferred or preferred format. If we were to conduct a follow-up study, we would gather more instances of disaffiliation and analyze the responses from the other participants rather than the disaffiliative responses themselves. In general, the topic of disaffiliation should be given more attention. Affiliation and disaffiliation are not only relevant to the flow of a conversation but also to the development of interpersonal relationships.

The topic of disaffiliation is one that is often overlooked in the language classroom but must be given more focus as it is highly relevant to the daily lives of English language learners. Through the analysis of the three excerpts, various disaffiliative practices employed during natural, everyday conversations were identified. These conversations were not designed to elicit disaffiliation; they were merely everyday interactions during which disaffiliation naturally occurred. Students will inevitably encounter a situation where they are faced with the need to express disaffiliation, or are the participant being disaffiliated with. Regardless, the skill to identify disaffiliation during interaction and resolve it is necessary for all speakers of English. However, this skill is not often developed during language class. This results in many students believing in the common misconception that English is straightforward and direct, even in expressions of disagreement. Although this can be true for some speakers of English, in actuality, disagreements are not always clearly identifiable. For second language learners, this is difficult to distinguish as they might not be fully knowledgeable about the pragmatics and nuances of the language. This gap in their knowledge can negatively affect the interactions they will have with native speakers and even other language learners. To allow for smoother conversations and successful interactions, students should learn about and experience disaffiliation in the classroom. This will help them form a new perspective of English, develop their communicative competence, and allow them to have more natural conversations.

Haugh, @. "-. 4. #. 3ocular mockery, "disaffiliation, and face. ~~Official Program~~, 4. =%-445.
 Heritage, 3. "45/1# ! cBergad state token and aspects of its sequential placement. Structures of social

- Selting, @. "-. 46#. The display and management of affectivity in clima' es of amusing stories. Journal o ' Pragmati s, 111, 4%0-.
- Stivers, T. "-. /#. Stance, ! lignment, and ! ffliation <uring Storytelling> (hen Fodding ,s a Token of ! ffliation. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 14# 04P?6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15326942.2017.1345444>
- (aring, H. Q. "-. 4-#. <oning disaffiliation with now%prefaced utterances. Language + , o%affi ation, 10# -=?P-6?. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2014.04.004>
- (ong, 3., E (aring, H. Q. "-. -. #. , onversation . nalysis an Se on Language Pedagogy/. O e or ESL TEFL Teachers