
CONVERSATION ANALYSIS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS TO LANGUAGE TEACHING

Didin Nuruddin Hidayat

Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University of Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: didin.nuruddin@uinjkt.ac.id

Received: 8th May 2019; Revised: 15th November 2019; Accepted: 28th December 2019

Abstract

The present study analyzed the use of Conversation Analysis in casual conversation and how it can serve as a potential means in language teaching. Casual conversation concerns the type of conversation that people do when they talk just for the sake of talking (Eggs & Slade, 1997). This includes daily conversations among people. Employing a qualitative research methodology, data were taken from a casual conversation taking place in Australia regarding a birthday party preparation between a husband and a wife whose native language is *Bahasa Indonesia*. Data were first transcribed in *Bahasa Indonesia* using CA conventions, and then were translated into English. The transcription of the conversation attempted to follow the guidelines proposed by Cook (1990) and Bailey (2008). The study found that turn-taking systems, adjacency pairs, overlaps, response tokens, and repairs were evident from the analysis of conversation. The conversation confirms the theories of CA: the occurrence of a large number of response tokens, such as *mm hm* or *yes*, various types of adjacency pairs, each speaker speaks one at a time even though there are several gaps and overlaps, and so forth. The study drew the implication of CA to language teaching. CA contributes to language teaching in terms of offering not only the authentic real-life communication, but also the authentic spoken interaction which will encourage learners to be able to produce authentic utterances. Also, CA can serve as a potential means to shape the students' ability as active participants in the learning process.

Keywords: casual conversation; conversation analysis; education; language teaching

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menganalisis penggunaan Percakapan dalam percakapan kasual dan bagaimana hal itu dapat berfungsi sebagai sarana potensial dalam pengajaran bahasa. Percakapan kasual menyangkut jenis percakapan yang dilakukan orang ketika mereka berbicara hanya untuk berbicara (Eggs & Slade, 1997). Ini termasuk percakapan harian antar orang. Dengan menggunakan metodologi penelitian kualitatif, data diambil dari percakapan kasual yang berlangsung di Australia mengenai persiapan pesta ulang tahun antara suami dan istri yang bahasa ibunya adalah Bahasa Indonesia. Data pertama-tama ditranskripsikan dalam Bahasa Indonesia menggunakan konvensi CA, dan kemudian diterjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Inggris. Transkripsi percakapan berusaha mengikuti pedoman yang diajukan oleh Cook (1990) dan Bailey (2008). Studi ini menemukan bahwa turn-taking systems, adjacency pairs, overlaps, response tokens, dan repairs terbukti dari analisis percakapan. Percakapan mengkonfirmasi teori-teori CA: terjadinya sejumlah besar response tokens, seperti *mm hm* atau *ya*, berbagai jenis adjacency pairs, masing-masing pembicara berbicara satu per satu walaupun ada beberapa celah dan tumpang tindih, dan sebagainya. Studi ini menarik implikasi CA terhadap pengajaran bahasa. CA berkontribusi pada pengajaran bahasa dalam hal menawarkan tidak hanya komunikasi kehidupan nyata yang otentik, tetapi juga interaksi lisan yang otentik yang akan mendorong peserta didik untuk dapat menghasilkan ucapan-ucapan otentik. Selain itu, CA dapat berfungsi sebagai sarana potensial untuk membentuk kemampuan peserta didik sebagai peserta aktif dalam proses pembelajaran.

Kata kunci: percakapan kasual; analisis percakapan; pendidikan; pengajaran bahasa

How to Cite: Hidayat, D. N. (2019). Conversation Analysis and Its Implications to Language Teaching . *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 6(2), 197-209. doi:10.15408/tjems.v6i2. 15138.

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v6i2.15138>

Introduction

As social beings, people allocate ample time to interact with others daily. This interaction does not only involve conversation regarding heavy topics, but also involve a conversation about simple everyday topics. Eggins and Slade (1997) believed that the latter is categorized into casual conversation. They argue that casual conversation is related to the type of conversation that people do when they talk just for the sake of talking. In casual conversation, language serves as a means for establishing social identity and maintaining relationships with other people. In a muslim world, casual conversation in the past was largely performed in places, such as mosques during daily congregations, marketplaces, public squares, and so forth (Semati, 2007). Casual conversation is guided by interpersonal objectives that drive people to conduct a conversation to expand the interpersonal relations that they possess with their counterparts. Hence, it can be interpreted that casual conversation includes the scope of the conversation about daily activities between people with people on topics, such as arranging appointments with others, planning holidays, discussing planned activities, and so forth.

Conversation Analysis (CA, hereafter) has drawn researchers' attention in examining spoken interaction among people. CA is one of the approaches in discourse which has its roots in the field of ethnomethodology, one of the branches in sociology developed by Harold Garfinkel (Bhatia et al., 2008). CA was then explicitly developed to conversation by its pioneers: Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (Schiffrin, 1994; Sidnell, 2007). According to Atkinson and Heritage (1984), the main objective of conversational analysis is "the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction (p. 1)". CA provides distinctive

characteristics in analyzing specific data as the other branches of discourse analysis, such as critical discourse analysis (CDA) and ethnography of communication, have. CDA perceives language as social practices and considers the context of language use to be fundamental (Darweesh & Abdullah, 2016; Fairclough, 2000; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Paltridge, 2012), and the ethnography of communication considers factors outside the interaction in its analysis, such as settings, participants, ends, genre (Hymes, 1972; Johnstone & Marcellino, 2010).

Meanwhile, CA avoids positing any categories (whether social or linguistic) whose relevance for participants themselves is not displayed in what is actually said" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 239). Hence, CA does not consider any other factors outside the spoken data. Another characteristic of CA is in terms of its attention to details in the spoken interaction as well as its concerns to minutes particles, which are pertinent to attempting to comprehend how language works (ten Have, 2007). Another distinctive feature of conversation analysis is that the analysis is based on interactions that occur naturally and are made up based on actual data recorded and transcribed in detail following applicable convention rules. Conversation analysis rejects an unnatural array of data collection methods conducted by simulating and preparing specific artificial interactive contexts in the conversation (Eggins & Slade, 1997).

The present study analyses a natural conversation using CA. Several analytical tools were used in analyzing the casual conversation: turn-taking systems, adjacency pairs, overlaps, response tokens, and repairs. Also, this study examines the implication of CA, in general, to language teaching.

Turn-taking system becomes one of the central features in CA (Harwood, 2006). The turn-taking analysis relates to how the speaker

takes turns speaking to avoid overlaps and "gaps" while no participant speaks. Coates (1986) supported by Schegloff (2007) explain that turn-taking is the time when the speaker and hearer exchange positions changing their role, so that the speaker becomes the hearer or vice versa. Then, Stenstrom (1994, p. 4) also states that turn-taking is the time when the speaker allows the listener, who will be the next speaker, so that he can comment on what the speaker says. He gives three procedures in turn-taking strategies in a conversation: "*taking the turn strategies, holding the turn strategies, and yielding the turns strategies.*" The taking- turn strategy is a strategy in which a speaker takes his/her turns when two or more people join together in a conversation. It may involve starting up, taking over, and interruption. The holding the turn strategy has occurred when the speaker carries on talking as he cannot control or hold the turns all the time. The last, yielding the turn strategy is a strategy in which the speaker gives away the turn rather reluctantly. Knowing turn-taking, people will know when they should talk to avoid monopolizing the conversation and make it runs smoothly.

Furthermore, in the act of the conversation, it becomes complicated for the speaker and hearer to share their roles in the turn-taking process (Mudra, 2018). It happens due to the conversation consists of a systematic pattern that is not easily predicted that as ordinary people need to take place simultaneously anticipatory, prediction process, production planning, and comprehension (Bögels et al., 2015). It refers to the term of adjacency pairs. According to Fakhruddin (2017), adjacency pair is an automatic pattern of utterances produced by different speakers that were spoken by the second speaker associated with the first speaker and expected to follow what initiated and uttered by the first speaker. Supporting this idea, Coulthard (1985) explains adjacency pairs are pairs of automatic

sequences utterances are produced by different participants that are considered the first speaker expects the second speaker to respond to his or her utterance. Thus, Levinson (2013) proposes the features of adjacency pairs: adjacent related to one another and utterances that uttered by different speakers. Also, there are ordered as the first speaker and second speaker, and each conversation has a pattern such as question-answers, greeting-greetings, offer-acceptance, and so forth. For instance, "A: What's up?" (Question) then B gives her response, "B: Nothing much." (Answer) (Yule, 1996).

Then, when more than one speakers speak at once a time in conversation, it will lead to the problematic of overlapping talk that breaks the organization of turn-taking system (Schegloff et al., 1977). Schegloff adds the "overlap" refers to talk more than one speaker at a time (Schegloff, 2000). Then, Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, & Angeles (1974) divide the overlap to become competitive and non-competitive. The competitive is made out by the speaker of the urge to attract attention away from the ongoing speech (Yang, 2001) to express the emotionally significant to the speaker such as the demand for new information or clarification, strong opinions or disagreement, shifting topic, or taking control the floor (Truong, 2013). Meanwhile, the non-competitive overlaps are a co-constructed discourse, "like back-channeling", try building communication engagement, and ratify the interlocutors' right to be speaking with the conversation (Hilton, 2016).

Moreover, it plays a crucial role in the co-participants (hearer/second speakers) to display their understanding of the current speaker in conversation (Gardner, 2001). In here, response tokens are involved. Response token refers to the deictic and indexical expression, including the interjection (Jawhar, 2018). It provides information to the speaker about the interlocutor stance on the previous talks

(Kendon, 1967). For instance, Schegloff (1982) intends to draw short responses token such as the word “yeah”. He proposes multi-function nature on that word, not only the confirmation of understanding but also demonstrates the agreement. Then, in conversation analysis, this response tokens treats according to the social context performed in the particular events (Jawhar, 2018) that show how they are understood and used by the interlocutor to have their subsequent turn (Jefferson, 1984).

Besides, when the speaker makes mistakes, the repair is commonly used to correct the conversation. (Levinson, 2013) defines repair as an effort to correct for misunderstanding, mishearing, and non-hearing words in conversation. According to Tang (2011), nine types of repairs involve: abandonment (to abort the old constituent), addition (to insert the new constituent), elaboration (to provide detail information), paraphrasing (to interpret the old constituent), reordering (to swap the position of two constituents), repetition (to repeat the constituents), replacement (to substitute one word to another), restructuring (to reorganize the syntactic pattern), and substantializing (to refresh the deictic expression with referentially).

Methods

The study employed a qualitative research methodology as it intends to understand a complex reality and the meaning of actions in a given context (Queiros et al., 2017), which fits with the present study. Further, the qualitative research methodology provides benefits in achieving comprehensive data and subsequently conducting an in-depth analysis of the data (Mohajan, 2018). Three basic principles should be taken into consideration when conducting CA-based research: “the principle of observability (the phenomena studied must be able to be observed and described), the principle

of availability (in order to observe and describe a phenomenon it has to be collectible) and the principle of symmetry (the way a researcher projects his or her viewpoint on the data is also a phenomenon that must be observed and described)” (Mondada, 2003, cited in Masats, 2017, p. 324-325).

The data were taken from a casual conversation in a muslim family between a husband and a wife whose native language is *Bahasa Indonesia*. In Islam, a family consists of a legally married couple (Jaafar-Mohammad & Lehmann, 2011). The conversation took place in a birthday party preparation setting in Australia. After the conversation data were obtained, they were first transcribed in *Bahasa Indonesia* using CA conventions (See table 1). The subsequent process was translating the data into English (See Table 2)

Table 1. Indonesian Transcriptions

Note : I = Istri (wife), S = Suami (husband)

| | |
|-----|---|
| 1. | I: nanti gimana rencana buat hmm (0.7) ulang tahun aku::? |
| 2. | S: ya gimana dong↑, maunya gimana? |
| 3. | I: aku sih pengennya (0.5) |
| 4. | S: mm hm↑ |
| 5. | I: niatnya tadinya mau di:: restoran↓ da::n |
| 6. | S: mm hm↓ |
| 7. | I: maunya jangan di rumah |
| 8. | S: mm hm |
| 9. | I: di restoran atau di Happy atau pokoknya di restoran (0.3) apaan lah |
| 10. | S: Iya, tapi kan kalau di:: restoran (0.5) biayanya banyak dong (0.5) mang |
| 11. | berapa orang yang mau diundang? |
| 12. | I: hmmm (0.5) banyak sih |
| 13. | S: Kira-kira? |
| 14. | I: 20 lebih kali |
| 15. | S: W(h)ah 20 lebih! kalau satu orangnya (1.0) taro 15 dolar ya:: (1.0) jadi 300 |
| 16. | dolar dong banyak bener |
| 17. | I: trus gimana dong? Option yang kedua sih hmm mau (0.5) berbequean gitu |
| 18. | S: Barbie tempatnya dimana? |
| 19. | I: di rumah bu Yoni. |
| 20. | S: hahaha emang boleh ma dia? |
| 21. | I: udah ngomong sih sama Vita |
| 22. | S: terus? |
| 23. | I: kata Vita 'oke asal tempatnya dirapiin aja udahannya' |
| 24. | S: iya cuman sama pak Yoni bu Yoninya boleh gak? |
| 25. | I: boleh-boleh aja, abis kalau (0.5) di:: (1.0) lake... |
| 26. | S: [mm hm] |
| 27. | I: [pengen] juga sih di lake cuman ga::k, gak nyantai ya? |
| 28. | S: iya juga tergantung cuaca juga, [ya kan]? |

29. I: [iya sih]
 30. S: kalau kita udah ngundang temen-temen (0.7) tapi (0.5) tau-taunya (1.0)
 31. cuacanya gak bagus kan, ya::: kacau juga
 32. I: trus gimana?
 33. S: ya::: mungkin (0.7) ya: barbequean aja kali, (1.0) gimana? ya: kalau di rumah
 34. kita kan jelas gak mungkin.
 35. I: aku gak mau juga
 36. S: hahaha, iya
 37. I: kita gak punya halaman belakang dan pasti bakalan berantakan banget
 38. S: ya udah, di rumah bu Yoni?
 39. I: tapi kamu ngomong dulu (0.5) minta ijin, kamu [do::ng]
 40. S:
 [hahaha], iya lah gampang
 41. terus (0.5) apalagi?
 42. I: (1.0) ya udah sekalian, maksudnya...
 43. S: heeh?
 44. I: hmmm (0.5), ulang tahun
 45. S: what do you mean?
 46. I: pernikahan, sama [itu:::]
 47. S: [sama] apa?
 48. I: sama bye-bye...
 49. S: maksud kamu::: farewell kita?
 50. I: iya
 51. S: yah, bye-bye mah [lain lagi] itu mah
 52. I: [lain lagi ya?] kan buat hemat
 53. S: iya hemat sih hemat tapi kan (0.5) itu lain acaranya ya kan bye-byenya
 54. masih lama, hahaha
 55. I: iya sih. dua bulan lagi ya?
 56. S: heeh trus kira-kira siapa aja yang diundang?
 57. I: ya::: temen-temen akulah, temen-temen dekat aja
 58. S: ya coba itung siapa aja
 59. I: Desri, [Lora]
 60. S: [mm,] hm
 61. I: Lora kan berdua...
 62. S: mm, hm
 63. I: mbak [Fitri]
 64. S: [iya] mas Hamim
 65. I: mas [Hamim]
 66. S: [terus?]
 67. I: Ifah
 68. S: Ifah juga?
 69. I: iya lah, dia kan temen aku
 70. S: mm hm, iya terus?
 71. I: Indah
 72. S: heeh
 73. I: (0.7) siapa lagi ya? Synthia, Eli
 74. S: iya
 75. I: temen-temen dekat [aja:::]
 76. S [hahaha] banyak banget ya, berarti ma spouse-
 77. spousesnya juga
 78. I: ya iya tapi kan itu 20an udah ma spousesnya
 79. S: mm hm, (0.7) iya terus barbequeannya ngapaïn aja?
 80. I: makan tapi kan kalau di rumah bu Yoni kan bisa karaokean tuh?
 81. S: mm, hm, iya boleh juga sih, di luar ya [acaranya]
 82. I: [ya emang] di luar
 83. S: mm hm
 84. I: makanya kamu minta permission dulu ma bu Yoni, ya kamu dong ceritanya
 85. mau buat acara [buat aku]
 86. S: [Hahaha]
 87. I: hahaha ya kan↑ (1.5) ya udah apaan lagi? budget ya dari

- ente lah
 88. S: ya pasti dong, trus apalagi?
 89. I: beli kue.
 90. S: beli kuenya dimana?
 91. I: Cheese Cake la:::h
 92. S: Cheese Cake, (0.5) selain itu?
 93. I: Michel, Michel kecil
 94. S: Mi::tchel?
 95. I: Michel Patisserie aya:::h
 96. S: Oh, Michel Patisserie
 97. I: iya
 98. S: iya tapi kuenya enakan mana? Michel apa cake, eh maksudku cheese cake?
 99. I: kalau Mitchell kan aga:::k lembek-lembek gitu ya
 100. S: mm, hm
 101. I: kalau Cheese Cake sih gak apa-apa tuh enak yang coklat straw[berry itu:::]
 102. S: [Berapaan] kira-kira?
 103. I: gede lagi tuh, sekitar 27 dolaran lah
 104. S: 27? mm hm

Table 2. English Transcriptions

Note : W = Wife, H = Husband

1. W: Then how about the plan for hmm (0.7) my birthday?
 2. H: What do you have in mind↑
 3. W: I would like (0.5)
 4. H: mm hm↑
 5. W: Celebrate it i::n a restaurant↓ a::nd
 6. H: mm hm↓
 7. W: don't wanna have it at home
 8. H: mm hm
 9. W: in a restaurant or at Happy or (0.3) any other restaurants
 10. H: but if it is held i::n a restaurant (0.5), it will cost a lot...(0.5) by the way,
 11. how many people are gonna be invited?
 12. W: hmmm, quite a lot.
 13. H: approximately?
 14. W: more than twenty perhaps
 15. H: wow, more than twenty! If one person co:::sts (1.0) let's say 15 dollars, the::n
 16. it is gonna be 300 dollars that is a lot...
 17. W: then, how? the second option is hmmm (0.5) having a barbeque
 18. H: where is the barbeque gonna be held then?
 19. W: in Mrs. Yoni's house, hahaha...
 20. H: hahaha, will she give permission?
 21. W: I've spoken to Vita
 22. H: then?
 23. W: Vita said, 'oke as long as you clean the place afterward.'
 24. H: I understand, but how about Mr. and Mrs. Yoni?
 25. W: I think they will give permission. if (0.5) it is done a:::t the lake...
 26. H: [mm hmm]
 27. W: [I would] love to, but it will no::t be relax, right?
 28. H: yes, it depends on the weather as well, [right]?
 29. W:
 [yes] you're right
 30. H: if we have invited our friends (0.7) but then (0.5) the weather is terrible, (1.0)
 31. the party i::s gonna be a complete mess.
 32. W: then, how?
 33. H: ye::s may be (0.7) just do: the barbeque then, (1.0) what do you think? If we
 34. do it at our house, it is impossible

35. W: I do not want to do it there either
 36. H: hahaha, yes
 37. W: we do not have a backyard, and it is gonna be very messy
 38. H: oke, at Mrs. Yoni's?
 39. W: but you talk to her first (0.5) ask her permission, you do that [oke?]
 40. H: [oke] that's
 41. easy (0.5) then what?
 42. W: (1.0) how about if we do the other occasion together, I mean...
 43. H: what do you mean?
 44. W: hmmm, birthday
 45. H: mm, hm?
 46. W: wedding anniversary celebration, with [tha::t]
 47. H: [with] what?
 48. W: with bye-bye
 49. H: you me:::an, our farewell?
 50. W: yes
 51. H: bye-bye is a [different] occasion, it's...
 52. W: [different?] that's to save some money...
 53. H: yes, saving is saving I know but (0.5) that's a different occasion, and it is
 54. still far away, hahaha
 55. W: yes, I see, another two months, right?
 56. H: yes, then who will be invited?
 57. W: hmm, my friends, just my close friends
 58. H: yes let's count them
 59. W: Desri, [Lora]
 60. H: [mm] hm
 61. W: Lora and her husband...
 62. H: mm hm
 63. W: [Fitri]
 64. H: [Yes,] Hamim
 65. W: [Hamim]
 66. H: [then?]
 67. W: Ifah
 68. H: Ifah too?
 69. W: yes, she is my friend as well
 70. H: mm hm yes, then?
 71. W: Indah
 72. H: mm hm
 73. W: (0.7) who else? Synthia, Eli
 74. H: mm hm
 75. W: just close [frie:::nds]
 76. H:[Hahaha] that's a lot, it means that we invite the spouses as well,
 77. right?
 78. W: yes, but twenty includes the spouses
 79. H: mm, hm (0.7) oke then what are we gonna do during the barbeque?
 80. W: eating, but if we do it at Mrs. Yoni's house we can have a karaoke
 81. H: mm, hm, that's a good idea, it's gonna be [outdoor]
 82. W: [yes, outdoor]
 83. H: mm, hm
 84. W: that's why you have to ask permission first from Mrs. Yoni oke? just said that
 85. you dedicate this occasion [for me]
 86. H: [Hahaha]
 87. W: hahaha (1.5) yes, then what else? You will pay for all the costs right?
 88. H: yes, for sure, then what else?
 89. W: buy a cake
 90. H: where should we buy the cake from?
 91. W: Cheese Cake would be::: good
 92. H: Cheese Cake? (0.5) any other options?

93. W: Michel, Michel's cake is small
 94. H: Mi:::tchell?
 95. W: Michel's Patisserie daddy:::
 96. H: ow, Michel Patisserie?
 97. W: yes
 98. H: yes, which is more delicious? Michel's or cake, hmm I mean Cheese Cake?
 99. W: Michel's is a bit too soft
 100. H: mm hm
 101. W: Cheese Cake is better, especially the chocolate straw[berry one:::]
 102. H: [how much is] it?
 103. W: the size is big enough, around 27 dollars
 104. H: 27 dollars, mm hm

The transcription of the conversation attempted to follow the guidelines proposed by Cook (1990) and Bailey (2008), asserting that in order to have a good transcription, the transcriber needs to pay attention to at least two aspects: the detail and straightforward transcription. These mean that the transcription should be listed as detailed as possible but does not contain excessive complication.

Results and Discussion

The present study found that one of the salient features found in the conversation is the existence of turn-taking, where the speaker changes turn to be a hearer and *vice versa* (Riest et al., 2018).

Table 3. Turn Constructional Unit

| No. | Examples | Lines | TCU Categories |
|-----|---|-------|-----------------------|
| 1. | W: Celebrate it i::n a restaurant↓ a::nd | 5 | Syntactic Completion |
| | W: I've spoken to Vita | 21 | |
| | W: I do not want to do it there either | 35 | |
| | W: we do not have a backyard, and it is gonna be very messy | 37 | |
| | W: yes, but twenty includes the spouses | 78 | |
| 2. | H: approximately? | 13 | Intonation Completion |
| | H: then? | 22 | |
| | W: then, how? | 32 | |
| | H: [with] what? | 47 | |
| | W: yes | 50 | |
| | W: Then how about the plan for hmm (0.7) my birthday? | 1 | |

| No. | Examples | Lines | TCU Categories |
|-----|---|-------|----------------|
| 3. | H: <i>but if it is held i::n a restaurant (0.5), it will cost a lot...(0.5) by the way,</i> | 10 | Actions |
| | W: <i>more than twenty perhaps</i> | 14 | |
| | H: <i>where is the Barbie gonna be held then?</i> | 18 | |
| | H: <i>hahaha, will she give permission?</i> | 20 | |
| | H: <i>I understand, but how about Mr. and Mrs. Yoni?</i> | 24 | |
| | W: <i>[yes] you're right</i> | 29 | |

Table 3 represents the examples of TCUs in three categories. The syntactic completion is found in lines 5, 21, 35, 37, 78, whereas the intonation completion is shown in lines 13, 22, 32, 47, 50. Meanwhile, the extracts from lines 1, 10, 14, 18, 20, 24, 49 demonstrate TCUs as actions. Being able to identify the Turn Constructional Unit (TCU, henceforth) is pertinent to predict when the transition occurs. Liddicoat (2011) accentuated that turns are composed of units called turn constructional units, and the composition of TCUs is largely context-dependent. He further asserted that to have a complete TCU, one of these categories should be fulfilled: syntactic, intonation, and action.

Table 4. Multi-Turn Constructional Units

| No. | Examples | Lines |
|-----|---|-------|
| 1. | W: <i>I would like (0.5)</i> H: <i>mm hm↑</i> W: <i>Celebrate it i::n a restaurant↓ a::nd</i> | 3-5 |
| 2. | H: <i>but if it is held i::n a restaurant (0.5), it will cost a lot...(0.5) by the way, how many people are gonna be invited?</i> | 10-11 |
| 3. | W: <i>more than twenty perhaps</i> H: <i>wow, more than twenty! If one person co::sts (1.0) let's say 15 dollars, the::n</i> | 14-15 |
| 4. | <i>the party i::s gonna be a complete mess.</i> W: <i>then, how?</i> | 30-31 |
| 5. | H: <i>ye::s may be (0.7) just do: the barbeque then, (1.0) what do you think? If we do it at our house, it is impossible</i> | 33-34 |

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 6. | W: <i>hmm, my friends, just my close friends</i> | 57 |
| 7. | H: <i>[Hahaha] that's a lot, it means that we invite the spouses as well, right?</i> | 76-77 |
| 8. | W: <i>that's why you have to ask permission first from Mrs. Yoni oke? just said that you dedicate this occasion [for me]</i> | 84-85 |

Table 4 describes the Multi TCUs found in the data. In a conversation, there are possibilities for speakers to create more than one TCU or multi TCUs. Liddicoat (2011) argued that multi TCUs are built not to introduce a new topic, but rather as an extension of the previous talk. Some of the examples of multi TCUs can be found in lines 3-5, 10-11, 14-15, 30-31, 33-34, 57, 76-77, 84-85. In lines 3-5, when Wife (W) said “*niatnya tadinya mau di:: restoran↓ da::n or had a plan to celebrate it i::n a restaurant↓ a::nd*”, her utterance is possibly complete with a completed falling intonation. However, she adds an increment *da::n* or *a::nd* with an incomplete intonation contour which shows she has another thing to say. What she actually did was cancelling the prior possible completion and deferring the possible completion to the end of increment.

Table 5. Adjacency Pairs

| No. | Examples | Lines |
|-----|---|-------|
| 1. | W: <i>Then how about the plan for hmm (0.7) my birthday?</i> H: <i>What do you have in mind↑</i> | 1-2 |
| 2. | H: <i>but if it is held i::n a restaurant (0.5), it will cost a lot...(0.5) by the way, how many people are gonna be invited?.</i> W: <i>hmmm, quite a lot.</i> H: <i>approximately?</i> W: <i>more than twenty perhaps</i> H: <i>wow, more than twenty! If one person co::sts (1.0) let's say 15 dollars, the::n it is gonna be 300 dollars that is a lot...</i> | 10-16 |
| 3. | H: <i>where is the barbeque gonna be held then?</i> W: <i>in Mrs. Yoni's house, hahaha...</i> H: <i>hahaha, will she give permission?</i> W: <i>I've spoken to Vita</i> H: <i>then?</i> | 18-25 |

| No. | Examples | Lines |
|-----|--|-------|
| | W: Vita said 'oke as long as you clean the place afterward.' H: I understand, but how about Mr. and Mrs. Yoni? W: I think they will give permission. if (0.5) it is done a:::t the lake... | |
| 4. | W: [I would] love to, but it will no::t be relax, right? H: yes, it depends on the weather as well, [right]? | 27-28 |
| 5. | H: you me:::an, our farewell? W: yes | 49-50 |
| 6. | H: yes, then who will be invited? W: hmm, my friends, just my close friends | 56-57 |
| 7. | W: <u>eat</u> ing, but if we do it at Mrs. Yoni's house we can have a karaoke H: mm, hm, that's a good idea, it's gonna be [outdoor] | 80-81 |
| 8. | H: where should we buy the cake from? W: Cheese Cake would be::: good | 90-91 |

Table 5 describes the adjacency pairs occur in the spoken interaction. It is a pair of utterances in which the second part is dependent on the first one (Cameron, 2001). Adjacency pairs “set up a *transition relevance* and expectation which the next speaker fulfills; in other words, the first part of a pair predicts the occurrence of the second” (Sacks, 1967, as cited in Coulthard, 1985, p. 69). There are several types of adjacency pairs: question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-rejection, invitation-acceptance, and so forth. The extracts from lines 1-2, 10-16, 18-25, 27-28, 49-50, 56-57, 80-81, 90-91 are some examples of adjacency pairs. Generally, the adjacency pairs occur in the conversation are a type of question-answer. Basically, adjacency pairs only consist of two turns; the current speaker asks the question and the next speaker answers it. Lines 10-16 demonstrate more than one turn of adjacency pairs. When *H* asked *how many people are gonna be invited?*, *W* did not give a specific answer. Hence, *H* reformulated his question to be more specific in order to have a satisfying answer, which then was given by *W*. Furthermore, Cameron (2001) mentions that

there is a preference system in adjacency pairs. For instance, the preferred answer for a proposal is an acceptance. Acceptance is generally done without elaboration, whereas refusal is the reverse. The abovementioned extracts follow this pattern in which *H* gave an implicit rejection towards *W*'s proposal by not giving a straightforward answer. Rather, he provided more elaboration on his answer.

Table 6. Overlaps

| No. | Examples | Lines |
|-----|--|---------|
| 1. | H: [mm hmm] W: [I would] love to, but it will no::t be relax, right? | 26-27 |
| 2. | H: yes, it depends on the weather as well, [right]? W: [yes] you're right | 28-29 |
| 3. | W: but you talk to her first (0.5) ask her permission, you do that [oke?] H: that's [oke] | 39-40 |
| 4. | W: wedding anniversary celebration, with [tha:::t] H: [with] what? | 46-47 |
| 5. | H: bye-bye is a [different] occasion, it's... W: [different?] that's to save some money... | 51-52 |
| 6. | W: Desri, [Lora] H: [mm] hm | 59-60 |
| 7. | W: [Fitri] H: [Yes,] Hamim | 63-64 |
| 8. | W: [Hamim] H: [then?] | 65-66 |
| 9. | W: just close [frie:::nds] H: [Hahaha] that's a lot, it means that we invite the spouses as well, | 75-76 |
| 10. | H: mm, hm, that's a good idea, it's gonna be [outdoor] W: [yes, out]door | 81-82 |
| 11. | you dedicate this occasion [for me] H: [Hahaha] | 85-86 |
| 12. | W: Cheese Cake is better, especially the chocolate straw[berry one:::] H: [how much is] it? | 101-102 |

Table 6 presents the findings regarding overlaps. Sacks (MS), cited in Coulthard (1985), asserts that according to the rule of American English conversation, a speaker speaks one at a

time ideally, speaking occurs without any overlaps or gaps in between. However, it is natural in conversation that overlaps often occur. From the data, the overlaps occur in lines 26-27, 28-29, 39-40, 46-47, 51-52, 59-60, 63-64, 65-66, 75-76, 81-82, 85-86, and 101-102. There are two possible reasons for this: the next speaker's failure in deciding whether the other speakers have finished the talk and, on the contrary, the next speaker's ability to understand the content even the current speaker has not finished the talk. For example, the extract from lines 101-102 is an example where the overlap occurs because the next speaker thought that the current speaker had finished their turn. *H* asked, "berapa kira-kira? or how much is it approximately?" before *W* finished her turn. *H* did this because he thought that the words *Cheese Cake* were the signal of *W* to finish her turn. *W* still has some other words to say, the *chocolate strawberry* one. Next, lines 28-29 provide an example of the overlap that occurs because the next speaker has already understood the content of what the current speaker said. In that extract, *W* knew that *H* would ask confirmation about the statement he made. Before *H* did so, *W* had already provided the response token *yes*. Cameron (2001) further distinguished between overlap and interruption, or hostile 'violation'. Interruption violates the turn-taking system and the speaker who does so, tend to have a willingness to take the floor. The violation often occurs in a political debate, for instance, where speakers try to deprive each other and take the floor away from the current speaker. However, the violation does not occur in this conversation. They are still categorized as overlaps since the next speaker's intention in doing the overlaps are merely to give an immediate response (lines 46-47, 75-76, 65-66, etc.) and to support the current speaker's talk in holding the floor (lines 28-29, 51-52, etc.).

Response tokens, kinds of discourse markers that are often neglected by language teachers and coursebooks writers, which are found from the data are *yes*, *mm hm*, *hmmm*, *oke*, etc. Each response token has its distinctive function. Two response tokens which often appear are *mm hm* and *ya* or *iya*. It is interesting to examine why *H* produces 14 *mm hm* responses. Several reasons for this are displaying passive reciprocity (Jefferson, 1984) and showing the understanding that the action is still continuing or has not finished yet (Huq & Amir, 2015; Schegloff, 1993). It should also be added that the massive production of *mm hmmm* also shows *H* attempts to fill the empty slot of *W*'s talk, or in other words, to minimize the gap. The use of *mm hm* also demonstrates that *H* pays attention during *W*'s talk. Next, *Ya* or *iya* is equivalent to *yes* in English. This response token has several possible functions. Wouk (2001) finds that *ya* or *iya* is very frequent in a typical Indonesian conversation. This is a reflection of the Indonesian cultural values, which show a great attention in maintaining the appearance of cooperative behavior. Likewise, the Islamic teachings also show the necessity of mutual respect and honor (Khalil, 2016).

Schegloff et al. (1977) break down the repair model in conversation into four main categories: self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other repairs. There are two kinds of repair that appear in the conversation. Firstly, self-initiated other repairs, a condition where the speaker initiates the problem, but the recipient is the one who solves the problem. This can be found in lines 90-91, where *H* initiates a repair sequence around the name of the cake shop mentioned by *W*. Then, *W* clarifies what it is supposed to be. Secondly, self-initiated self-repair, a condition where the speaker both initiates the problem and solves it by him/herself. This can be recognized in line 94.

The type of this repair is same-turn repair where the speaker corrects his word at the same time and provides cut-offs sound stretches item, *uhm*, before repairing the problem.

CA has provided a great deal of contribution to language teaching. Some of its theories have been useful in developing materials for language teaching. Research studies (e.g., Hermansyah, 2013; Wong, 2002) reveal that the telephone dialogues found in several coursebooks do not follow what has appeared in the natural telephone conversation. More specifically, some elements, such as summon-answer, greetings, cannot be found or are incomplete in the course books. This observable fact occurs due to the coursebooks writers' reliance on their intuitive skills in writing English grammar (Flaherty, 2018) as well as their intuition about what is correct or well-formed (Baleghizadeh & Rastin, 2015). Hence, this will lead learners to produce an unnatural combination of utterances, or worse, lead to possible misunderstanding when students have their real experience in speaking over the phone. This is because they did not get sufficient input about how the telephone conversation occurs and rely on what has been learned from the coursebooks. CA attempts to offer not only the authentic real-life communication, but also the authentic spoken interaction which will encourage learners to be able to produce authentic utterances. This is very crucial due to the findings in second language research, which reveals that in order to develop a full mastery of language, learners need to develop both declarative and procedural knowledge (Eldali, 2019; Johnson, 1994). This means that in order to be proficient in English, learners are demanded to comprehend not only the language usage, but also the language in use. Research studies have confirmed the importance of communication strategies in the classroom (e.g., Al-Shboul & Huwari, 2016; Ghasani & Sofwan,

2017; Jumiati, Gani, & Sari, 2017; Thompson, 2017).

It has been apparent that there is a major shift in language teaching from being teacher-centered to student-centered. One of the notable characteristics of this new paradigm is that students have a greater role in learning. CA contributes to this change in terms of its usefulness to shape the students' ability as active participants in the learning process, or specifically as Riggensbach (1991) defined as observers of language in use. The concept of CA can be applied as one of the teaching and learning techniques, especially for intermediate and advanced students. The teacher asks their students to observe a natural spoken interaction and record it using an audio recorder, for instance. Then, they are asked to transcribe it using the CA transcription convention. Afterward, the students share their findings and discuss them with the whole class. In this way, the students not only learn the language but also know how real interaction occurs, which in turn will increase their interactional skills. Furthermore, this will enhance their discourse and strategic competence.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis shows that the conversation confirms the theories of CA: the occurrence of a large number of response tokens, such as *mm hm* or *yes*, various types of adjacency pairs, each speaker speaks one at a time even though there are several gaps and overlaps, etc. There is no such rule-breaking in this conversation. The analysts of CA have been trying to persuade others about the potential contribution that CA could make to the language teaching. It seems that their efforts start to have the result. Both theories and practice of CA can be applied, for example, in developing language teaching materials and training

students to be active observers, instead of passive recipients. The study concludes that CA contributes to language teaching in terms of offering not only the authentic real-life communication but also the authentic spoken interaction which will encourage learners to be able to produce authentic utterances.

References

- Al-Shboul, Y., & Huwari, I. F. (2016). Congratulation strategies of Jordanian EFL postgraduate students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 79–87.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: transcribing. *Family Practice*, 25(2), 127–131.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Rastin, H. (2015). Investigating metapragmatic information in language teachers' books: A case of top notch. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 3(2), 47–56.
- Bhatia, V. K., Flowerdew, J., & Jones, R. H. (2008). *Advances in Discourse Studies*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. SAGE Publication.
- Coates, J. (1986). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language*. Longman.
- Cook, G. (1990). Transcribing infinity: Problems of context presentation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 1–24.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Darweesh, A. D., & Abdullah, N. M. (2016). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Sexist Ideology. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(30), 87–95.
- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. Cassell.
- El-dali, H. M. (2019). An alternative approach to linguistic theories of language acquisition: Focus on the cognitive theory. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 10, 1488–1522.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). Critical analysis of media discourse. In P. Marris & S. Thornham (Eds.), *Media Studies: A Reader* (pp. 308–328). New York University Press.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. SAGE Publication.
- Fakhrudin, M. (2017). Penerapan Kaidah Berbahasa Dalam Percakapan Berbahasa Indonesia. *Journal of Language Learning and Research*, 1, 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.22236/JOLLAR>
- Flaherty, T. (2018). *An exploratory case-study into tensions between classroom practices and EFL teachers', learners' and coursebook writers' beliefs on grammar instruction*. Universitat de Barcelona.
- Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ghasani, B. I., & Sofwan, A. (2017). Appraisal and Speech Structure of Contestants' Speeches in Speech Contest of ESA WEEK Competition. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 149–155.
- Harwood, C. (2006). *Discourse Analysis A study of turn-taking in a scripted conversation*. February, 1–10.
- Hermansyah, M. (2013). *Preferred and dispreferred responses in the dialogues of junior high school's electronic English textbooks*. Universitas Airlangga.
- Hilton, K. (2016). The perception of overlapping speech: Effects of speaker prosody and listener attitudes. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, 08-12-

- Sept(December), 1260–1264.
<https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2016-1456>
- Huq, R., & Amir, A. (2015). When the tokens talk: IRF and the position of acknowledgement tokens in teacher-student talk-in-interaction. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 9(1), 60–76.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 1–14). Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Jaafar-Mohammad, I., & Lehmann, C. (2011). Women's rights in Islam regarding marriage and divorce. *Journal of Law and Practice*, 4(1), 1–13.
- Jawhar, S. S. (2018). Small but Multi-Functional: Response Tokens in Content Language Integrated Learning Interaction. *SSRN Electronic Journal, January 2016*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2898633>
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens “yeah” and “mm hm.” *Papers in Linguistics*, 17, 197–206.
- Johnson, K. (1994). Teaching declarative and procedural knowledge. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn, & E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teachers* (pp. 121–131). Prentice Hall International.
- Johnstone, B., & Marcellino, W. (2010). Dell Hymes and the Ethnography of Communication. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, & P. Kerswill (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. SAGE Publication.
- Jumiati, J., Gani, S. A., & Sari, D. F. (2017). Communication strategies used by the English teacher in teaching speaking skill. *Research in English and Education (READ) Journal*, 2(4), 53–62.
- Kendon, a. (1967). This Week's Citation Classic: Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica*, 26(44), 22–63.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918\(67\)90005-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(67)90005-4)
- Khalil, A. I. A. E. (2016). The Islamic perspective of interpersonal communication. *Journal of Islamic Studies and Culture*, 4(2), 22–37.
- Levinson, S. C. (2013). Action formation and ascription. In T. Stivers & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 103–130). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Liddicoat, A. (2011). *An introduction to Conversation Analysis*. Continuum.
- Masats, D. (2017). Conversation analysis at the service of research in the field of second language acquisition (CA-for-SLA). In E. Moore & M. Dooly (Eds.), *Qualitative Approaches to Research on Plurilingual Education* (pp. 321–347). Research-publishing.net.
- Mohajan, H. K. (2018). Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 7(1), 23–48.
- Mudra, H. (2018). Adjacency Pairs As Uttered in the Conversations of Sofia Coppola's Lost in Translation Movie Script. *Humanus*, 17(1), 126.
<https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v17i1.8050>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (2nd Editio). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Queiros, A., Faria, D., & Almeida, F. (2017). Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research methods. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(9), 369–387.
- Riest, C., Jorschick, A. B., & de Ruiter, J. P. (2018). Anticipation in turn taking: mechanisms and information sources. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 89(6), 1–14.
- Riggenbach, H. (1991). Discourse analysis and spoken language instruction. *Annual*

- Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 152–163.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of “uh huh” and other things that come between sentences. *Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, March, 71–93.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society*, 29(1), 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500001019>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413107>
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
- Semati, M. (2007). Media, the state, and the pro-democracy movement in Iran. In I. A. Blankson & P. D. Murphy (Eds.), *Globalization and media transformation in new and emerging democracies* (pp. 143–160). SUNY Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2007). Comparative studies in Conversational Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 36, 229–244.
- Stenstrom, A. B. (1994). *An Introduction to spoken interaction*. Longman.
- Tang, C. (2011). Self-repair devices in classroom monologue discourse. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics*, 1(January), 93–120.
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publication.
- Thompson, C. (2017). How do teachers view strategic planning as contributing to the development of speaking in EFL classes? *Journal of Second Language Teaching & Research*, 1(2), 90–112.
- Truong, K. P. (2013). Classification of cooperative and competitive overlaps in speech using cues from the context, overlapper, and overlappee. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, 1404–1408.
- Wong, J. (2002). Applying conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 40, 37–60.
- Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker ya. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 171–191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00139-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00139-3)
- Yang, L. C. (2001). Visualizing spoken discourse: Prosodic form and discourse functions of interruptions. *Proceedings of the Second SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue - Volume 16*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1118078.1118106>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.