



Moral Characters Represented in the Students' Turn-Taking of Conversation

Luluk Isani Kulup¹, Bambang Yulianto², Budinuryanta Yohanes³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Negeri Surabaya Indonesia

ABSTRACT: In every good interaction, there is always a change of roles between the speaker and the listener. Research on turn-taking in student conversations is interesting to do because of the diversity of regional origins and languages used by the students. This results in the emergence of distinctive patterns in the conversations among students. Through the turn-taking patterns, the characters of the speech participants can be known. This study uses a qualitative approach with data in the form of speech utterances delivered by students, which provide information of their character representation. The data collection technique used is the note-taking technique. The results obtained are the characters of social care, sharing, honesty, helping, cooperative, ethical, and working together.

KEYWORDS: Character, Conversation, Students, Turn-Taking.

INTRODUCTION

To create a good and smooth interaction in communication, turn-taking plays important role because only with it everyone involved can well interact in a conversation. In a good interaction, there is always a change of roles between the speaker and the listener. One of the interesting objects to study in pragmatics is student conversations in daily communication, both in formal and casual situations. This is because the interactions that occur are spontaneous, unplanned, and natural. Besides, in student conversations, the interaction does not only occur between two people but may also involve more than two or more people.

This study takes the research subjects in a university in Surabaya because of the diversity of the students' regional origins and the characteristics of the language used. It results in the emergence of distinctive patterns in the conversations between the students. The patterns produced are meaningful. Through the pattern of speech exchange (turn-taking), it can be seen the character of the speech participants. Ramli (2003) states that character has the same essence and meaning as moral or personality. A person is said to have good character means to have a good personality, to be a good human being, and a good citizen.

The characteristics of the turn-taking patterns provide an overview of the politeness of speech participants. It is because the patterns must be considered and obeyed to maintain relationships in social interaction. A violation of the turn-taking patterns is actually a violation of politeness. When ignored, it will certainly have a negative impact on society. According to Howe (in Hutami, 2010), turn-taking is an important requirement in oral communication because it makes the conversation participants take part proportionally in an ongoing interaction. Howe (in Hutami, 2010) also argues that interaction in a conversation can occur if those involved take turns to talk to each other in a natural or unplanned conversation. The turn-taking pattern does not have a standard pattern. The course of interaction is controlled by the participants of a dialogue or conversation. However, Sack, et al. (in Trahutami, 2010) states that there are basic turn-taking patterns in everyday interactions. For example, when someone is talking, the other should listen and not interrupt.

Sack, et al. (in Hutami, 2010) formulates the basic rules of turn-taking patterns as follows:

- 1) If the next speaker has been appointed, the other speaker is not allowed to speak.
- 2) If the next speaker has not been determined, the participants in the conversation decide for themselves who will take the next turn to speak.
- 3) If the next speaker has not been determined and no participant has the initiative to continue the conversation, the last speaker can resume the conversation.

According to Rosidi (2004), turn-taking describes the regularity of the conversion process. The form of regularity can be easily seen from a series of speech acts which are represented as adjacency pairs. In essence, adjacent pairs are a series of two utterances that are next to each other and produced by two different speakers.



Regarding the adjacency pair, Cook (in Trahutami, 2010) says that it occurs when someone's utterance can make or bring up another utterance as a reaction or response. This adjacency pairs of utterances consist of two utterances. The first utterance is the trigger of the emergence of the next utterance while the second utterance is a response to the previous utterance. The preferred response is a response that is in accordance with the expectation of the speaker, while the disliked is a response that the speaker does not expect.

Richards and Schmidt (in Rani, 2004) describe several possible adjacency speech pairs: a greeting is followed by another greeting; a call is followed by an answer; a question is followed by an answer; a farewell is followed by a goodbye; an accusation is followed by (a) an admission, (b) a denial, (c) a justification, (d) an apology to oneself, and (e) an opposition; an offer is followed by (a) an acceptance, (b) a refusal; a pleading is followed by (a) a grant, (b) a suspension, (c) a refusal, and (d) a challenge; praise is followed by (a) an acceptance, (b) an agreement, (c) a refusal, (d) a shifting, and (e) a return.

As for the definition of character, The word character comes from the Greek *charassein*, which means to engrave (painting, drawing), such as people who paint paper, carve stone or metal (Ryan, 1999). Thus, character is then interpreted as a special sign or characteristic, and therefore gives birth to a view that character is a pattern of behavior that is individual, a person's moral state. Majid (2012) defines it as attitude, psychological traits, or morals that distinguish a person from others. The term includes behavior, habits, likes, dislikes, abilities, potential, values, and thought patterns. Barnawi and Arifin (2012) state that character means mental or moral quality, moral strength, name, or reputation. In the psychological dictionary, a character is a personality that is viewed from an ethical point, i.e., someone's honesty which has a relationship with relatively fixed traits.

Lickona (1991) also defines character education as a deliberate effort from all dimensions of social life to help shape character optimally. The term character education has been introduced since the 1900s. From the understanding conveyed by Lickona above, it can be seen that there is a development process that includes knowledge (moral knowing), feelings (moral feeling), and action (moral action), as well as providing a strong basis for building a coherent and comprehensive character education.

Hay et al., (in Purnami, 2013) give several character criteria: 1) Social sensitivity. People with character always develop sympathy and empathy. 2) Nurturance and care, a person with character is a person who protects, provides protection, and maintains good relations with others. 3) Sharing, cooperation, and fairness. People with character always develop the nature of sharing, cooperation, and fairness. 4) Help others. People with character are people who like to help others. 5) Honesty. People of character are honest individuals. 6) Moral choice. People with character always prioritize morals and ethics. 7) Self-control and self-monitoring. People with character always control and introspect themselves. 8) Social problem solving and conflict resolution. People with character are able to solve social problems and conflicts.

Multicultural student communication activities cannot be separated from the use of language to convey messages. The realization of language in communication is realized through speech/utterances made by the speaker to the speech partner with a specific purpose. Pragmatically, speech/language activities carried out by speakers are commonly referred to as speech acts (Ekawati, 2017). A speech act is an act that is shown through the conversation (speech) of the speaker (Ramadhanti and Mujianto, 2020). The orientation of speech acts is towards the meaning/meaning of the actions reflected through speech (Nuramila, 2020). Therefore, speech acts play an important role in communication activities in everyday life.

The pattern of turn-taking and the adjacency pairs that appear in a conversation will reveal the characters of the participants. For example, it has been agreed that the rule says that the change of speech is determined by appointing the next speaker, and the appointed participant is entitled to speak in turn. However, some speech participants deliberately violate the agreement. Such violation indicates that the participants do not care about others, do not try to maintain relationships with others, and like to cause conflict.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with sociopragmatic analysis orientation. The data sources are students from various regions, i.e., students from Flores, Ambon, Mentawai, Madura, Papua, and Java who live in Surabaya. The data collection techniques were interviewing, observing, and field recording. The analysis techniques were sorting, reversing, and connecting (Sudaryanto, 2015). The sorting technique was done by dividing or separating to locate the place of the data in the speech. The reverse technique was done by looking for other data as a comparison so that further analysis can be carried out. Connecting technique is done by building



a substantive relationship between data. There are two ways to build the relationship: (1) looking for correlations between categories and (2) giving meaning to relationships between data

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Representation of Characters in turn-taking (TT) Patterns

The TT patterns are described in three ways as follows:

1. The speaker chooses the next interlocutor (SCNI)
2. The participants in the conversation decide for themselves to speak (PDTs)
3. If the addressee is unable to continue the speech, then the speaker will continue, meaning that the speaker continues his turn (SCS)

a. TT through SCNI

Turn-taking in SCNI situations can occur in both formal and informal situations. The previous speaker provides the opportunity for the speech partner to become the next speaker. As seen in the data below:

Data	Indonesian	English
1	<p>IM : <i>Ade ingin cepat sembuh?</i></p> <p>NE : <i>Iya kakak. Saya ingin cepat sembuh kakak. Kakak mungkin tau obatnya?</i></p> <p>IM : <i>Ade coba minum obat cacing tanah. Saya yakin, Ade pasti sembuh kalau minum itu.</i></p> <p>NE : <i>Apa kakak? (ekspresi kaget) minum cacing tanah? Kakak... yang benar saja kakak?</i></p> <p>IM : <i>Ya...perlu dicoba kan? Sudah banyak yang minum obat itu dan sembuh. Kalau Ade tidak percaya...ya terserah.</i></p>	<p>IM : <i>Ade (you) want to get well soon?</i></p> <p>NE: <i>Yes kakak. I want to get well soon kak. Maybe you know the medicine?</i></p> <p>IM : <i>Ade (you) should try taking earthworm medicine. I'm sure Ade will get better if (you) take it.</i></p> <p>NE: <i>What kak? (shocked expression) taking earthworms? Brother... really?</i></p> <p>IM : <i>Yes... need to try, right? Many have taken the medicine and recovered. If Ade (you) don't believe it... it's up to you.</i></p>

The subjects are IM and NE in a relaxed situation under the topic of earthworm medicine. In data (1) IM as a speaker allowed NE to answer the question, 'Ade, (you) want to get well?' In this case, NE is the next speaker. The mention of *Ade* and *Kakak* is common in everyday conversations to distinguish between seniors (*Kakak*) and junior students (*Ade*). In the first sentence, 'Ade (you) want to get better?' and in the third sentence, 'Ade (you) should try to take earthworm medicine.' IM has chosen NE as the next speaker by allowing NE to answer IM's question. In the second and fourth sentences, NE immediately responded to IM's question by answering and asking again 'Maybe you know the medicine?'

TT through SCNI is marked by asking the addressee to speak. Looking closely at data (1), there was a question from the speaker, which was then answered by the addressee. A feedback question is delivered from the addressee to the speaker. This is because the addressee still does not believe in the earthworm medicine offered by the speaker.

Regarding the description of the character, data (1) shows that IM as the speaker is very concerned about NE, as the addressee. They support each other and protect each other because they both live overseas. The TT shows the character of caring, sympathy, and empathy for fellow friends referred to as Social Sensitivity. This concern is shown by the convincing offer-sentence 'Ade (you) want to try taking earthworm medicine. I'm sure Ade will get better if you take the medicine'. In addition, the caring character in the conversation shows a convincing character that can encourage the sufferer to get well soon.

Data	Indonesian	English
2	<p>PA : <i>Ehm ...cara menelitinya itu Anda mencari novelnya dulu baru mencari teorinya atau mencari teorinya dulu baru mencari novel?</i></p> <p>NZ : <i>Ehmm ...saya itu pertama mencari novelnya dulu pak, sehabis saya baca itu kebetulan dari salah</i></p>	<p>PA : <i>Ehm...(which one is) the way to do this research, looking for the novel first and then looking for the theory or Looking for the theory first then looking for the novel?</i></p>



<p><i>satu dosen pembimbing itu menyuruh untuk bertanya kepada dosen satra kemudian saya tanya dan menggunakan teori ini mas. Coba sama teori ini. Kemudian cocok pak.</i></p> <p>PA : Dosen pembimbingnya satu atau dua?</p> <p>NZ : Satu pak!</p> <p>PA : Kok salah satu?</p> <p>NZ : Iya satu pak, mohon maaf saya salah pak!</p> <p>PA : Hehehe salah satu berarti ada yang lain...</p> <p>NZ : Tidak Pak! Hem...satu kok Pak!</p>	<p>NZ: Ehmm... I looked for the novel first, sir, after I read it, it happened that one of the supervisors told me to ask a literature lecturer and then I asked him about it. He said, try this theory. Then it turns out that it fits sir.</p> <p>PA: One or two supervisors?</p> <p>NZ : One of them, Sir!</p> <p>PA: Why one of them?</p> <p>NZ: Yes, sir, I'm sorry, I was wrong, sir!</p> <p>PA : Hehehe one of them means there is another...</p> <p>NZ : No sir! Hmm... one, sir!</p>
--	---

The subjects are PA (speaker) and NZ (addressee), the context is spoken in a formal situation, namely thesis exam under the topic of novel analysis. In contrast to data (1), data (2) was a formal situation when the student took the thesis exam. There was no feedback from the addressee because the situation did not allow him to ask questions. The speaker provided an opportunity for the addressee to become the next speaker by asking a question. In this context, the speaker and the addressee had previously determined their respective roles in the conversation. The SCNI method in this situation was a direct response from the addressee, resulting in another question from the speaker with the same topic.

Thus, the TT through SCNI can be marked by giving questions to the addressee/speech partner. It appears that the addressee responded by asking, again and again, to clarify what will be done next. Regarding the character description, in data (2) there are self-control and self-monitoring characters. This character is a picture of someone who can always exercise self-control and introspection. It can be observed that the student (the addressee) in the conversation was trying to her mistakes when answering the speaker's questions by answering 'Yes, sir! Sorry I was wrong sir!'

b. TT through PDTs

In this kind of TT, the speaker does not determine who will take the next turn to speak, but the speech partner/addressee chooses himself to respond to what is conveyed by the speaker, hence becoming the next speaker. This pattern can be seen in the data below:

Data	Indonesian	English
3	<p>FT : <i>Kapan ya ujian skripsi gelombang II?</i></p> <p>BY: <i>Maret mungkin, dengar-dengar begitu. Biasanya sih!</i></p> <p>AN: <i>Tepatnya awal maret loh!</i></p> <p>BY: <i>Wah!...kudu siap-siap iki rek! Kamu wis bab 4 yo Nit?</i> (Anita)</p> <p>AN: <i>Tinggal dikit.</i></p>	<p>FT: When is the second period of the thesis exam?</p> <p>BY: March maybe, I hear so. Usually!</p> <p>AN: To be precise, early March!</p> <p>BY: Wow!...you have to get ready for this! You have already been in chapter 4, Nit?</p> <p>AN: Just a bit more.</p>

The subjects are FT (speaker), BY (addressee), and AN (addressee). The context is spoken in a relaxed situation at the boarding house. The topic is the thesis exam. In data (3), FT (the previous speaker) delivered a question "When is the second period of thesis exam?" without requiring an answer from the addressees or without asking and choosing the next speaker to respond to the question. BY and AN chose (initiated) to be the next speakers by responding to FT's question. The two addressees, i.e., BY and AN, responded by explaining when the second period of the thesis exam would be held. BY responded uncertainly about the time of the exam that was around March, but AN then made it clearer that the exam would be held in early March. BY and AN responses indicate a TT by way of PDTs.

The same occurs in data (4). In the following data, SA did not choose and determine who would take the next turn to speak, but LI and ME chose themselves to act as the next speakers to respond to SA's statement. However, data (4) is slightly different



from data (3) in that SA responded again to the two speech partners to further clarify the difference between apprentice 2 and apprentice 3.

Data	Indonesian	English
4	<p>SA : <i>Asik....magang dah selesai. Istirahat seklah...</i> LI : <i>Ehh....magang sing nang sekolahan iku tah?</i> ME : <i>Yalah Lik! Magang yang mana lagi.</i> LI : <i>Oalahhhh.....magang 2 itu tah?</i> ME : <i>Magang 3 lik! Kakean nang omahlali kabeh</i> SA : <i>Magang 2, magang 3 iku....yo bedo rek...koyok gak ngerti ae.</i> LI : <i>Paham...paham.</i></p>	<p>SA: Cool....the internship is over. Take a break... LI : btw....Internship at school, right? ME: Yes Lik! which one else? LI : oh..... that 2nd internship, right? ME : Internship 3, Lik! I'm mostly at home.... forget everything. SA : Internship 2. Internship 3 is.... different. It's as if you don't know. LI : Yes I see... got it.</p>

The subjects are FT (the previous speaker), LI, and ME (the next speaker and addressee). The context is delivered in a relaxed situation with the topics of internship 2 and internship 3. Data (3) illustrates SA's concern explaining the difference between apprentices 2 and 3 to the addressee. At the same time, it illustrates the addressee's incomprehension to the issue being discussed though it was about their own experience. The speaker tried to keep the situation going well by giving an explanation. The result was that LI (addressee) understood well what ME was saying. It appears that the character of nature and care (maintaining good relations between individuals), as well as the character of social sensitivity, was carried out by ME.

c. TT through SCS

In TT through SCS, the speaker continues his/her turn because there is no verbal response or satisfactory answer from the addressee or the speech partner is unable to continue the conversation. Such TT aims to maintain the situation in the conversation so that a good relationship can be established between the speaker and the addressee (speech partner).

Data	Indonesian	English
5	<p>WI : <i>Flor!... di Flores banyak sapi gak?</i> FL : <i>Emm....(berpikir)</i> WI : <i>Saapi...binatang peliharaan itu loh!</i> FL : <i>Aisshhh....ya banyaklah...kambing dan kerbau malah lebih banyak. Di sana tuh malah dipakai bahan belis kalau mau menikah. Tahu gak belis?</i> WI : <i>Gak!</i> FL : <i>Belis tuh mahar say...kalau di sini mahar beragam, sampai emas pun dijadikan mahar.</i></p>	<p>WI : Flor!... Are there a lot of cows in Flores? FL : Erm....(thinking) WI : Cows... that livestock, you know! FL : Aisshhh.... yes, a lot. ... there were even more goats and buffalo. There, they are even used as 'belis' if someone wants to get married. Do you know what 'belis' is? WI: No! FL : 'Belis' is a dowry... Here, the dowry varies, even gold is used as a dowry. There, cows are an expensive dowry.</p>

The subjects were WI (Speaker) and FL (Addressee). The context was a conversation in a relaxed situation. The topic was related to farm animals. In data (5), WI as the previous speaker asked the addressee (FL) a question regarding cows in Flores. But FL could not answer directly and only responded 'Emmm...' to the speaker. This answer was not satisfactory for the previous speaker because the answer was not clear in meaning. As a result, FL asked the speaker to repeat or clarify the question. In the next utterance, WI clarified her question which was then immediately responded by FL because she already understood the meaning of the previous utterance. FL explained at length to clarify that cows are not only consumed as meat but are also used as 'belis' (a dowry) for the people of Flores.

Thus, the word 'Emm...' which is followed by a thinking expression in the second FL's utterance indicates that FL as an addressee asks the previous speaker to repeat the question or clarify the previous utterance. This is intended to clarify the speech partner's understanding of the previous speech and is a realization of TT by the way of SCS. Regarding the description of the



characters in data (5), it can be explained that the addressee tried to explain to the speaker the meaning of 'belis' in the Flores Manggarai language. Sharing knowledge with the addressee is a character of helping others, namely helping without being asked.

The following data (6) shows the same pattern. There was a breach of agreements in the TT, when the participant who was appointed to speak did not give a satisfactory answer.

Data	Indonesian	English
6	LI : “ <i>Heh Mar! Kamu wes ngado zizah ta?</i> ” NE: ” <i>Aku gak ikut ngado yo?</i> ” MA: “ <i>Ya Allah Nda, biyen iku kan wes nyungok nyungok ambi bibub nang royal, luarang-larang, ono sih tapi kari seng jubek-jubek. Ya akhire dorong ngado.</i> ” LI : “ <i>Hahahaha.</i> ” MA: “ <i>Lha kamu mare bowoh ta?</i> ” LI : “ <i>Uwes, wingi tak tukokno nang PTC</i> ”	LI : “ <i>Hey Mar! Have you given a present to zizah?</i> ” NE: “ <i>I'm not giving gifts, am I?</i> ” MA: <i>Oh my God, Linda, I had a look with my mother at the Royal. Everything is expensive. There are cheap ones, but bad ones. Finally, I have not given a gift.</i> LI: “ <i>Hahahaha.</i> ” MA: <i>Well, have you donated?</i> LI : <i>Yes, yesterday I bought it at PTC.</i>

Subjects were LI (Speaker) and MA (Addressee), Context: Spoken in a relaxed situation, Topic: Gift. In data (6), LI, as the speaker, asked MA about a gift for Zizah. MA, as the appointed addressee, responded with a long sentence. But before MA responded, NE interrupted the conversation between LI and MA. In that conversation, NE had made a violation by interrupting LI's question, which was intended for MA as the addressee she chose. In this case, NE committed a violation called moral choice, not prioritizing ethics when there was an ongoing conversation around her. Interrupting the conversation of others when the speech is not addressed to the person concerned is a bad act.

Character representation represented by the turn-taking patterns and the adjacency pairs

In the following description, Adjacency Pairs is acronymized as AP. Turn-taking patterns based on Adjacency Pairs are described as various possibilities that occur in conversations, including in students’ conversations that contain a variety of interesting and quite varied forms of speech.

1. Request statement with the 'accept' answer

The utterances in the data below are students' daily conversations that begin with a request statement and bring up the answer 'accept' accompanied by a farewell greeting by both the speaker and the addressee.

Data	Indonesian	English
7	IM: <i>Sayang, minta bantuan tolong nanti kalau habis makan kamu di kantin, singgah di oma dulu beli dengan pulsanya saya! Saya mau pulang, soalnya ada tamu di kos.</i> IR: <i>Ok sayang! Saya pergi dulu ya! Dah...(sambil melambaikan tangan)</i> IM: <i>Iya sayang. Saya juga pamit pulang ya, Terima kasihnanti pulsa kuganti.</i> Subyek IM (PN) dan IR (PT). Konteks: Dituturkan pada saat menyatakan bantuan dengan saling menyebutkan kata sayang menandakan keakraban hubungan keduanya	IM: <i>Honey, I'm asking for help. When you finish eating at the canteen, please stop at 'oma' first, buy me credit! I want to go home because there are guests at the boarding house.</i> IR: <i>Ok honey! I'll go first! Bye... (while waving)</i> IM: <i>Yes, honey. I'm also home, thank you I'll pay your money later.</i> IM (Speaker) and IR (Addressee) subjects. Context: Spoken when expressing help by mentioning the word 'darling' to each other, indicating the closeness of the relationship between the two.

In data (7), IM, as the speaker, requested the addressee for assistance to buy cellphone credit. The IR, as the addressee, immediately responded in the form of willingness, marked by the phrase 'Ok dear!'. Next is the response from IM as a speaker with a farewell to the addressee.



Looking closely at the conversation, it can be stated that the statement in data (7) is not just a statement that produces an answer, but it is also an indirect request to the addressee to buy cellphone credit using the addressee's money because of their close relationship, as indicated by the expression 'honey' between the speaker and the addressee.

The turn-taking based on adjacency pairs in the conversation describes the character of helping others, namely the Speaker's request for help/assistance to the Addressee, followed by willingness and is responded by the speaker with a thank, showing that the speaker appreciates the help of the addressee.

2. Questions that generate other questions

Generally, a question is followed by an answer; but in the following data, questions are responded with other questions.

Data	Indonesian	English
8	IM: Hei Bebeb, ada dengar berita nggak kalian? TS: Berita apa? IM: Itu lo, siapa namanya? Saya sudah lupa namanya. Hmm... itu loh namanya Atik ya? TS: Ada apa dengan Atik Beb? IM: Ya Tuhan... kalian benaran tidak tahu?	IM: Hey Bebeb, have you heard the news? TS: What news? IM: That's you. What is her name? I've forgotten his name. Hmm... that's it, Atik? TS: What's wrong with Atik, Beb? IM: Oh my God... you really don't know?

Subjects: IM (Speaker) and TS (Addressee). Context: spoken at a casual time at the campus cafe. Topic: talking about other friends. In data (8), IM as the speaker conveyed an utterance in the form of a question to the addressee (TS) who responded with another question to IM because she did not know what answer would be given to IM. In the next utterance, IM asked TS again regarding the previous question.

Looking closely, questions in data (8) are answered by other questions because IM did not deliver a clear question. This pattern often occurs in student conversations, talking about the goodness or badness of other friends who are not present in the conversation situation. The pattern used is A-B-A. Regarding the description of character, no good cooperation occurred between the speaker and the addressee, as indicated by unclear or incomplete questions responded to by other questions. Violations of the cooperative character in these conversations often occur in student conversations in relaxed situations.

3. Complaints followed by offers that elicit 'accept' responses

The utterance in the following data is an 'offer' question that begins with a statement of complaint, which is responded to by the other interlocutor with another question.

Data	Indonesian	English
9	IM: Skripsi itu memang memusingkan sayang. Dari pada kita pusing pikir skripsi, mending kita beli rujak. Mau tidak kamu rujak? CN: Iya maulah sayang. Kamu yang traktir ya Beb? IM : Ok beb, biar aku yang traktir. Ambilkan dulu beb di tas saya ada uang, minta tolong beb! CN: Tas yang mana beb? IM: Tas yang paling besar itu beb.	IM: The thesis is indeed confusing, honey. Instead of worrying about the thesis, we'd better buy <i>rujak</i> . Do you want <i>rujak</i> ? CN: Yes, honey. Do you want to treat me? IM : Ok, sist, let me treat. Get the money in my bag, please, <i>beb</i> ! CN: Which bag, sist? IM: That's the biggest bag, sist.

Subject: IM (Speaker) and CN (Addressee), context: spoken by two students. Topic: thesis, followed by an offer to buy *rujak*. In data (9), IM, as the speaker, stated her complaint that did not require a response from the addressee. But in her next statement, she stated that she wanted to buy *rujak* by asking an 'offer' question that required a response from the addressee as her adjacency pair. The response from CN as the addressee was a direct response of approval but accompanied by the sentence 'Do you want to treat me?' which IM immediately responded to.



Thus, it can be stated that, in the conversation, there was a close conversation aimed at maintaining the close pair relationship between the speaker and the addressee. The pattern that appears in the conversation is A-B-A. If observed closely, there is a social sensitivity character, shown by the speaker and the addressee. The speaker complained that she was tired of her thesis. She then offered her speech partner who was close to her to buy *rujak*. The addressee immediately responded 'Yes, honey'.

4. A call that results in a ‘commanding’ answer

Calls in everyday life are common in formal, informal, or casual situations. The responses that appear vary, depending on the situation and conditions at the time the conversation occurs. In data (10), it appears that NA and VE have leisure activities at the boarding house.

Data	Indonesian	English
10	<p>NA : “Vidaaaa...”</p> <p>VE : “Oe ...masuk Nil!”</p> <p>NA : “Vid punya teh?”</p> <p>VE : “Itu nang mejo.”</p> <p>NA : “ Minta yo vid?”</p> <p>VE : “Iyot.”</p> <p>NA : “Aku tadi mau beli... tapi lupa.”</p>	<p>NA : “Vidaaaa...”</p> <p>VE : “Oe... Please come in, Nil!”</p> <p>NA : “Vid, do you have tea?”</p> <p>VE : “That, on the table.”</p> <p>NA : "I want the tea, okay, Vid?"</p> <p>VE : "Okay."</p> <p>NA : “I was going to buy it... but forgot.”</p>

Subjects: NA (Speaker) and VE (Addressee). Context: spoken in a relaxed situation in a boarding house. Topic: related to 'tea'. The data illustrates that NA wanted to drink tea. NA, as the speaker who started the conversation, made a call in a loud voice addressed to her speech partner (VE), which was then responded with the sentence 'Oe... Please come in, Nil!'

If observed, in data (9), there is not only a call that produces an answer but it was also accompanied by questions by NA to clarify her request. This can be expressed as a character of attention to maintain a good relationship (nurturance and care) between the speaker and the speech partner.

5. A request that brings up an answer followed by a question

The utterances in the following data elicit various answers from the speech partner. To open the conversation, the speaker made an apology. An apology is a polite request to help or do what the person wants, as seen in the following conversation:

Data	Indonesian	English
11	<p>AN : <i>Mohon maaf, minta perhatiannya sebentar. Selamat sore semua.</i></p> <p>KL : <i>Soreee.....!</i></p> <p>AN: <i>Kata Pak Dusun... itu...</i></p> <p>BI : <i>Pak dusuuuuunn... Kepala Dusun... hahaha,</i></p> <p>AN: <i>Maaf...maaf...maksud aku Kepala Dusun itu. Beliau membutuhkan sampah tempat, jadi disuruh beli terpalnya tok.</i></p> <p>BI : <i>Terus Bang? Maksudnya, warga butuh tempat sampah gitu tah?</i></p> <p>AN: <i>Itu, penampungan sampah yang baru belum terurai, tadi kan di atas cuma dipilah-pilah. Mana yang kaleng, mana yang bukan.</i></p>	<p>AN : Sorry, I need your attention for a moment. Good afternoon all.</p> <p>KL : Afternoon.....!</p> <p>AN: Said Mr. villages... that...</p> <p>BI : Mr. village The head of the village hahaha,</p> <p>AN: Sorry...sorry...I mean the village head. He needed a trash can, so we were told to just buy the tarpaulin.</p> <p>BI: So, Bro? I mean, people need trash cans, right?</p> <p>AN: Shelter for new waste that has not been decomposed. Previously, it was just sorted. Which ones are cans, and which ones are not.</p>

Subjects: AN (PN) and BI (PT) accompanied by group members. Context: told in a social internship situation in Diken Village, Mojosari Sub-district, Mojokerto Regency. Topic: related to the need for tools and materials for the waste bank. In data (11), AN, as the previous speaker, conveyed an apology addressed to the speech partner (BI). This apology was responded to by the group in the discussion. Furthermore, there was a response from the speech partner, correcting the mention of the head of a village. AN



apologized again for the mispronunciation. In the next statement, BI asked about the need for trash bins, to which AN responded by explaining that waste still had to be sorted before trash bins were available.

Thus, it can be stated that the conversation has an A-B-A pattern: An apology followed by a response, a question, and another response. The conversation indicates a student with polite character by often saying sorry in a meeting activity. In this case, the ethical character (moral choice) was maintained by the students in the conversation.

6. A greeting followed by another greeting and followed by a question

Greetings in the daily life of students in campus life raise various variations of responses, depending on where the students come from. The closer their relationship, the longer the sentences used by both the speaker and the addressee.

Data	Indonesian	English
12	<p>IM: Selamat siang teman-temanku yang super-duper cantik! ER: Selamat siang juga Beb! IM: Ya Tuhan sedang apa kalian di sini? TS: Hemm, lagi santai saja Beb. Dari mana saja kau Beb? ER: Apa itu? IM: Saya dari kantin. Oh, ini pentol Beb. Terus kalian hanya duduk santai saja?</p>	<p>IM: Good afternoon my super-duper beautiful friends! ER: Good afternoon too, Beb! IM: Oh my God, what are you doing here? TS: Hemm, just relax, Beb. Where have you been, Beb? ER: What is it? IM: I'm from the canteen. Oh, that's a meatball stick, Beb. So you just sit back and relax?</p>

Subjects: IM (speaker), ER (addressee), and TS (addressee). Context: spoken while relaxing on campus to wait for the next lecture. In data (11), IM, as a speaker, greeted with long sentences to ER and other friends. The sentence 'Good afternoon my super duper beautiful friends!' resulted in a response from several speakers who were present in the situation. Among them were ER and TS who responded directly to the greetings conveyed by IM. ER responded with 'Good afternoon too, Beb!' (*Beb* is a familiar call for a close friend). On the other hand, TS responded with a statement first, which was then followed by a question that caused IM to respond to TS's question even though ER interrupted with a question to IM about what IM brought at that time.

Thus, greetings are not always answered with other greetings but with various responses according to what the speech partner wants. Even greetings can be responded to with a variety of statements, questions, and even accusing questions, 'So you guys just sit back and relax?' The character of politeness in the conversation can be seen in the greeting which is responded to by greeting as well. This conversation is a student's daily life, whether in a relaxed situation or not. The greeting is an effort to maintain good relations between individuals in the context of the continuity of daily interactions.

7. Accusing followed by a denying answer followed by a question, accusing, and ordering

Accusing utterances either intentionally or unintentionally are often spoken by students when carrying out daily conversations in any situation. This gave rise to varied responses as well. Responses may vary depending on the context in which students live. The conversation in data (13) is a conversation between a Madurese student and a student from Java.

Data	Indonesian	English
13	<p>NA : " Vid kamu tadi pinjem sandal Nevada coklat? " VE : " Enjek Nil! " NA : " Kok nggak ada ya? " VE : " Mek bisa? Ada yang minjem ta? " BI : " Bis pakai gak mau kembalikan ke tempatnya! " NA : " Siapa loh yang pinjem? " VE : " Coba tanyakan ke yang lainnya. " NA : " Iya nanti ae, sekarang pinjem sandalnya dulu yo? "</p>	<p>NA: "Vid, did you borrow the brown Nevada sandals?" VE: "No, Nile!" NA: "Why isn't it there?" VE: "How come? Anyone borrowed it?" BI: "After wearing it, you don't want to return it to its place!" NA: "So who borrowed?" VE: "Try asking the others." NA: "Yes, later, can I borrow your sandals now?"</p>

Subjects: NA (PN), VE (PT), and BI (PT). Context: spoken in a relaxed situation in a boarding house. Topic: Borrowing sandals. In data (13), NA, as the speaker, conveyed an accusation with indirect sentences, addressed to the speech partner (VE). VE denies it with a denial sentence, 'No Nil!'. This sentence was then followed by a question by the speaker ("Why isn't there, huh?"), which was responded by the addressee with the question ("How come?"). These two questions elicited a response from another speech



partner (BI) with the sentence accusing 'After wearing it, you don't want to return it to its place which has the meaning of telling 'If you wear sandals, return them to their place'. This accusatory sentence was followed by another question by NA, 'Who borrowed it?' VE then responded with an indirect commandment to ask another friend about the whereabouts of sandals, 'Try asking someone else'. The conversation stopped until the speaker expressed his willingness to answer 'Yes later... Now can I borrow your sandals?'. Thus, the longer the conversation the more varied the possible utterances for the adjacency pair.

In connection with the description of the characters in the conversation, it can be stated that the utterance of 'accusing' then 'denying' violates the character of moral choice because of negligence which results in an accusing answer followed by denial.

CONCLUSION

Based on the description in the data analysis, it can be seen that the characters based on turn-taking are nurture and care (maintaining good relations between individuals), social sensitivity, helping others, and moral choice. Character descriptions based on the adjacency pairs obtained nurturance and care characters (maintaining good relations between individuals), social sensitivity characters, helping others, cooperative, and moral choice characters.

REFERENCES

1. Barnawi & M. Arifin, 2012. *Strategi & Kebijakan Pembelajaran Pendidikan Karakter*. Yogyakarta: Ar Ruzz Media
2. Chaer, Abdul. 2007. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
3. Ekawati, M. 2017. Kesantunan Semu pada Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Marah dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Adabiyat: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 1(1), 1–22
4. Filia. 2012. Alih Bicara dalam Percakapan Bahasa Indonesia Dialek Betawi, (Online). (<https://icssis.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/09102012-23.pdf>), accessed on 19 October 2012.
5. Kurniawan, Syamsul 2013. *Pendidikan Karakter Konsepsi & Implementasi Secara Terpadu di Lingkungan Keluarga, Sekolah, Perguruan Tinggi, dan Masyarakat*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
6. Lickona, Thomas. 1991. *Educating for Character: How Our School Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
7. Majid, Abdul, dan Dian Andayani. 2012. *Pendidikan Karakter Persepektif Islam*, Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
8. Nadar, F. X. 2013. *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Graha Ilmu.
9. Nuramila. 2020. *Kajian Pragmatik Tindak Tutur dalam Media Sosial*. Banten: Yayasan Pendidikan dan Sosial Indonesia Maju.
10. Purnami, Rahayu S. 2013. *Menjadi Pribadi Profesional dan Berjiwa Besar*. Bandung: Simbiosis Rekatama Media
11. Rani, Abdul. 2004. *Analisis Wacana*. Jawa Timur: Bayumedia Publishing.
12. Ramadhanti, P. F., & Mujiyanto, G. 2020. Impresi Tindak Tutur Tidak Langsung Tidak Literal terhadap Kepekaan Sosial Peserta Didik dalam Pembelajaran di MTs Surya Buana Malang. *Estetik : Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia*, 3(2), 171–184
13. Ryan, Kevin dan Karen E. Bohlin. 1999. *Building Character in Schools: Practical Ways to Bring Moral Instruction to Life*. San Francisco: JOSSEY-BASS A Wiley Imprint.
14. Rosidi, Imron. 2004. Struktur Pertukaran dalam Kupas Tuntas Calon Presiden Di Trans TV. <http://guru-umarbakri.blogspot.com/2009/05/artikel-ilmiah-kebahasaan.html>, accessed on 2 April 2020.
15. Sudaryanto. 2015. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
16. Trahutami, Sriwahyu Istana. 2013. Struktur Pola Alih Tutur pada Percakapan Anak-Anak. *Jurnal Izumi*. Vol. 5 No. 1, pp 1-9.
17. Yule, George. 2014. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
18. Zubaedi. 2011. *Desain Pendidikan Karakter*. Jakarta: Kencana.

Cite this Article: Luluk Isani Kulup, Bambang Yulianto, Budinuryanta Yohanes (2022). Moral Characters Represented in the Students' Turn-Taking of Conversation. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 5(4), 1020-1029