Pedagogical Research Journal
Vol. 1 No 2. December 2023, pp.27-32
P-ISSN: Procces E-ISSN: Process, DOI:

Analyzing the Structure of Formal and Informal Conversation of English Education Students Lancang Kuning University

Rista Yuli[1], Marwa Marwa[2*], Fedra Rolinca[3], Putri Manalu[4], Winda Sitanggang[5]

Universitas Lancang Kuning ; marwazuhri81@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
keyword 1; conversation
keyword 2; analysis
keyword 3; turn taking
keyword 4; overlap
keyword 5; adjacency pairs

Article history:

Received 2023-05-20
Revised 2023-06-01
Accepted 2023-06-29

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to analyze the formal and informal conversational structures of English Language Education students at Lancang Kuning University. The method used in this study is the Conversation Analysis (CA) method. The data in this study are transcripts of English Education students' conversations in the form of elements in the conversational structure including turn taking, overlap, and adjacency pairs. The data sources in this study are YouTube videos and transcripts of student conversations in formal and informal conversations. Formal topics include student discussions about thesis supervisors, Masters plans, TOEFL, PPL, coursework, and so on. And informal topics include student discussions about ethnic Chinese, places to hang out, and food. Data collection techniques using record and transcript techniques. The steps of analysis in this study by way of Conversation Analysis. The results of this study are that there are elements of conversational structure which include turn taking (formal and informal topics), overlap, and adjacency pairs. In each of the elements of the conversation structure that is found, of course, has an influence on the flow of the conversation. Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that there were irregularities in the conversation structure of English Language Education students in May 2023.

Corresponding Author:
Marwa Marwa
Universitas Lancang Kuning ; marwazuhri81@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool used by humans to communicate and interact with each other, between individuals and individuals, individuals and groups, and groups and groups. According to Finocchiarno (1964:8). Language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols, enabling all people in a particular culture, or other people who have studied that cultural system to communicate or interact. Theories about language have Lots discussed, written, discussed, as well as developed by linguists, that is because language has become a discipline knowledge that is in great demand, and also language has become the most important part in the realm education. Language is not only used in a formal context, but also on informal context.

In everyday life there is often the use of language or communication, as is the case in student association. Language events are often encountered , namely the use of language in communicating both formal and informal activities. These language events are often encountered, namely during leisure activities, chatting, waiting for the lecturer or being discussed in lectures. Communication or interaction is done the student indirectly there is the use of elements in the conversational structure such as turn taking , overlap, and adjacency pairs.

Turn taking is in a talk-in interaction is a key factor that ensures the process of exchanging roles between the speaker and the speech partner runs smoothly . Adjacency pairs are most commonly found in what schemaloff and sacks described as a "single conversation," a unit of communication in which a single person speaks and a second person speaks and a second person replies to the first speaker's utterance. G.Jefferson (1974), and other scholars say that overlap or overlap is also a matter that needs to be studied in AP, because AP is one of the six approaches in discourse analysis (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; AP is (conversational analysis) the science of interdisciplinary, an inductive approach that examines interactions in conversation (Albert, 2017:1). In dialogue , a speaker must listen response to the interlocutor, so that the relationship between the sentence and what is said is an adjacency pair or side-by-side pairs (Albert, 2017; Martyawati, 2017; and Juanda & Azis, 2018a).

The focus of this article is to analyze the conversion topics by English students in formal and informal contexts and non-academics. In the speech turn model, there are relevant transitions. That is, on the first occasion, party A acts as the speaker; while on the next occasion, party B who plays the role of speaking in the conversation. And so on, with the understanding that if both parties are like this then the people involved in a conversation may only consist of two people, may also consist of more than two people, as in discussions (Tarigan, 1979; Park, 2009; and Abidin, 2013). During discussions, interruptions are common
as the norm in conversation (Weatherall & David, 2018). Specifically in language class, Juanda (2011) states that language is a subject for current attitudes and beliefs, and structurally cannot be ignored in language class (Juanda, 2011:3). The uniqueness of speech should be understood by other ethnic groups so that there is a good communication relationship between speakers or the implementation of communicative speech (Yang, 2007; Reyaz & Tripathi, 2016; and Juanda & Azis, 2018b). Therefore, it needs detailed linguistic analysis of conversations (Stapleford, Elizabeth & Amanda, 2017). Besides that, speakers in the class need to know the social aspects of conversation.

Speech overlap often occurs in multi-stakeholder conversations, and is a domain where speakers can pursue a variety of communicative goals. Most uses of language are interactive and involve rapid changes. The speech opportunity-taking system has a number of striking properties, namely: statements are brief and responses are rapid. fast, but the spins vary and often have very complex constructions, so the underlying cognitive processes are very dense. Although neglected in cognitive science, this system has profound implications for language processing and acquisition (Tarigan, 1979; Abidin, 2013; and Levinson, 2016). H. Wesselmeier & HM Muller (2015), and other scholars, investigated the preparation of verbal answers in interrogative sentences, by measuring WR (Response Time) or RT (Response Time) and potential readiness related to Response (RP). RP-onset can be influenced by the syntactic structure of the question leading to the preparation of the initial response (Murphy, 2007; Agustinalia, 2014; and Wesselmeier & Muller, 2015).

Each conversation has its systematic pattern and the patterns are predictable though sometimes they are not easily predicted. This refers to the term Adjacency Pairs. Schegloff (2007: 3) states that Adjacency Pairs are sequential turn of a speaker and a hearer whose speech can "be tracked from where they came from, what is being done through them, and where they might be going" during conversation. Conversation consists of an orderly sequence as uttered by a speaker and hearer. Such sequences are known as pairs of utterances which are expected to be interrelated. Furthermore, Schegloff and Sacks

(1973: 259-296) state that in Adjacency Pairs there are particular acts as produced by the speaker and the hearer and are usually noticeable such as greeting-greeting, question - answer, offer accept / decline. Adjacency Pairs consist of first pair part and second pair part. Each pair of parts is identified by looking at the utterance as produced by the speaker and the hearer.The data were taken from video conversations of students of the English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Education and Vocational

2. METHODS

This research is a type of qualitative research . The technique used is conversation analyze . Analysis of student conversations during conversations in public places where conversations have been recorded in video form and uploaded to YouTube. The data is obtained by making a video transcript of the conversation. Conversation analysis includes turn taking and adjency pairs.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data presented in this study is in the form of written data. The data sources for this research are conversations of English education students which contain formal discussions and formal discussions including thesis supervisors, journals, research courses, TOEFL, plans after completing undergraduate education, practical field experiences, and others. Studies, Lancaang Kuning University, Indonesia. The source of the data came from students of Batch 2021, Semester 4. Data was collected in May 2023. Data analysis, for spoken data that had been recorded was transcribed in written form, then the dialogue was analyzed based on an analysis of the conversational approach in discourse analysis. Data analysis also involves the process of inductively looking for patterns of interaction and explaining emic logic or language behavior (Sudaryanto, 1993; Hanifah, 2010; and Albert, 2017).

The following research questions are presented :

1. What is the form of turn taking when discussing formal and informal contexts?
2. How often does the conversation overlap?
3. How structured (adjacency pairs) are the conversations?

Informal discussions include places to hang out, food, and Chinese ethnicity.

In this discussion the author presents answers to the formulation of the problem contained therein to find out the use of elements in conversational structures by English education students. This research involved 5 students and produced:

3.1 The Form Of Turn Taking When Discussing Formal And Informal Contexts.

Turn taking that occurs during formal discussions and informal discussions is dominated by a student. Based on the data, there were 23 changes of speech. Giving turns to speak continues irregularly until the conversation is over. This can be seen in some of the formal conversation fragments as follows:

- Conversation fragment 1

  F : Itu kemarin kalian ada yang ikut- ikut itu nggak sih tes PNS gitu?
  A2 : P3k?
  F : Iya..
  N : Kakak ikut
  F : Kakak ikut? Lulus? Enggak?
  N : Passing grade nya lulus
  N :Rankingnya nggak.

- Conversation fragment 2

  A1 : Kalau yang lain

A2 : Dan bisa dibilang gak mempersulit
F : Ini terserah kah dosennya siapa?
A1 :Bebas
F : Yang penting Bahasa inggriskan?
N : Iya
F :Kalau aku pak syahdan sih, kayak nyambung aja sama dia//
A2 : //Iyakan nyambung sama bapak tu
F : Nyambung sama bapak tu
A2 : Gak terlalu serius
F : Hmmm gak terlalu tegang iya juga
A2 : Kak neni? Pasti mam dekan?
N : Kalau aku dua
A1 : Bukan mam dekan eeh bu refi
A2 : Ooohhh ketawa
F : Oooh
A1 : Eeh bagusloh bu refi
N : Bu refi itu bagus loh

In informal discussions, turn taking can be seen from the following conversation fragment:

A2 : asa tau kafe kaisar itu gak sih, asa pernah kesitu kalau gak salah ya?
F : yg mana
A2 : ituloh yang cake cake tu yang baru dimana vin? Di apa ? limbungan
K : dilimbungan deket kafe di limbungan tu ha
F : udah lama
A2 : gak ah baru
K : baru
A2 : yang jual cake, kalau ggak salah asa kemaren lebaran kesitulah

3.2 There Is Often Overlap In The Conversation.

In that conversation, there was a lot of overlap, as when one of them spoke , one of the others also spoke. This can be seen in several excerpts of the conversation as follows:

- Conversation fragment 1

F : Tap kalo dia lebih kayak cinta nya ke orang indo//gitu Mau enggak sih dia masuk
A2 : Mau mau mau di kuansing banyak.//
K :Di Kuansing banyak//
A1 : Saya tidak tahu apa-apa//
A2 : Gak ada cina ya di sana //
F : Asa lucunya apa, dia orang cina kan tapi// tapi logatnya bahasa Jawa nya
A2 : Ada, cina jawa ada//
N : Ada yang lebih bagus//lagi Bahasa jawanya dari kita
F : Kek yang di Tiktok itu//
A1 : Tau tau tau//

- Conversation fragment 2

N : //berarti tugas mam refika?
A1 : //udah kan?
K : //yang mana
A2 : //UAS nya kan

N : //UAS nya
A2 : //kita tuh ngajar
N : //iya ngajar
A2 : //presentasikan
N : //heeh
A1 : //mam refi??
A2 : //persentasi itu berarti
K : //lupa pasti?
N : //iyaaa
A1 : //sumpah aku lupa sih
A2 : //yang itu yang awal awal

3.3 Structured Or Not (Adjacency Pairs) The Conversation.

Based on the data obtained, there are several types of adjacency pairs , namely:

- Question – Answer

A1 : Oke, kita kan udah mau semester 5 ini //, sebentar lagi semester 6, 7 kira-kira nih untuk dosen skripsi kalian lebih cocok bimbingan dengan dosen siapa dari prodi Bahasa inggris
F : //Iya
A2 : Kalau aku, mam lina mam Marwa kalua gak sama pak syahdan soalnya kalau dilihat dosen itu sih yang effortnya kemahasiswa itu pengen cepat gitu biar mahasiswa itu lulus
A1 :Membantu?
A2 :Iya membantu
A1 : Kalau yang lain
A2 : Dan bisa dibilang gak mempersulit
F : Ini terserah kah dosen nya siapa?
A1 :Bebas

One of the students asked about the thesis supervisor, then another student answered. The answer is simple and appropriate to the question asked.

- Offer – Acceptance

N : Kenapa gak kita vote? Satu dua tiga
A1 : Aah enggaklah gini ya
N : Ketawa
A1 : Gini ya kita berapa dosen sih prodi Bahasa Inggris
N : Banyak
F : Banyak woi
A1 : Pak Syahdan, Mam Marwa, Mam Refika, Bu Desti

Based on the fragment of the conversation above, one of the students rejected a student's question about voting for their favorite lecturer.

DISCUSSION

Based on data analysis, it was found that there was a conversational structure among the five students in formal and informal discussions. The conversational structures found include turn taking, overlapping, and adjacency pairs. In this study, the turn taking findings are based on the conversational structure theory put forward by Yule. Yule (2006: 122) suggests that turn taking is a process of changing roles between speakers and speakers in a conversation where there are no signs or rules. That is, every conversation

actor has the same right to speak. Based on this theory, the findings in this study fulfill the occurrence of turn taking between the five students. The turn taking system that occurred was recognized and realized by the five students. Therefore, they are aware of getting a turn and giving a turn to the other person.

Overlap is based on Yule's theory (2006: 124) explaining that overlap is the state of speakers and speakers speaking at the same time. Based on this theory, the findings in this study prove that there are a lot of overlaps in the conversations of English education students. In the conversation there is overlap due to lack of awareness in the rules of turn to talk to each other .

The last part of the conversation structure is adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are based on Yule's theory (2006: 132) explaining that adjacency pairs are patterns that occur automatically in conversation and always consist of two parts uttered by different parties. Based on this theory, the findings in this study prove that in the conversation between the five students there are adjacency pairs. The adjacency pairs found were caused by questions that were answered with answers and there were offers that were responded with rejection.

4.CONCLUSION

This study proves that conversations between students in formal and informal interactions show turn taking , overlap, and adjacency pairs. Turn taking in conversations between students occurs because there is an opportunity to speak in formal and informal interactions. Turn taking in this conversation is only dominated by one student is irregular. Overlap in this conversation occurs because of speech or the use of the same lingual elements. There are two adjacency pairs in conversations between students, namely, question-answer where a student gives a question to another student and they also answer the question, and offer-acceptance where a student makes an offer about voting and is answered by another student.

REFERENCES

Dwiyan, Irma & Ngudining (2019). "Deikis' Analysis of Indonesian Language Education Student Conversations" in *Korpus Scientific Journal, Volume 3, Number 2 [August].*

Juanda (2019). "Conversation Analysis of Urban Students in the Classroom Learning Process: Case Studies of FBS UNM Students in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia" in Journal of Social Science Education and Humanity, Volume 12(1) [May].

Chepinchikj, Neda & George Thompson. (2016). “Analyzing Cinematic Discourse Using Conversation Analysis” in Discourse, Context & Media, Volume 14, pp.40-53

Purwoko, Herudjati. 2008. "Discourse Analysis: Discourse Studies for Everyone". Jakarta.

Mudras, Heri (2018). “Adjacency Pairs as Uttered in The Conversations of Sofia Coppola's Lost in Translation Movie Srput”.

Brown, Gillian & George Yule. (1985). Discourse Analysis, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://youtu.be/7s_1H3EJxG8