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## INTRODUCTION

#### Conversation or oral communication is one type of communication (Isgianto, 2016). When people converse, they share common conversational principles that interpret each other's statements as contributions to the conversation (Richard & Schmidt in Surya & Sedeng, 2018). Therefore conversation is an unavoidable part of human life. Conversation occurs in all conditions and situations, regardless of time and place. A conversation has social purposes for people as interactional functions by expressing their feeling, exchanging information, and preserving social relations (Brown & Yule, 1983). Conversation occurs at school, at the office, at the market, on the street, and in various other places, moreover, conversation occurs in virtual using the internet, social media, and online meetings. A conversation consists of two or more people who exchange information, feelings, or keep their social life running well.

#### According to Furo (in Pardede et al., 2021), the spontaneity with which two or more individuals interact in formal or informal circumtances of ordinary life distingushes conversation. This means that when two or more people talk, every utterance they make is spontaneous, rather than planned. However, in certain context, this condition may change. Conversations in formal settings, such as debate or discussion forums, traditional or religious ceremonies, and seminars, cannot be compared to casual daily conversations because they necessitate several produces, such as when, where, and how in their rutterances (Pardede et al., 2021).

#### When having a conversation, there are many things that can be revealed from every word or sentence that people say. Conversations can be analyzed using conversation analysis (CA) theory. CA is one approach in discourse that aims to find patterns of action contained in conversations (Wooffit, 2005). Someone will indirectly produce a pattern that comes from their conversation. Adjacency pairs are what they are called. There are utterance pairs that frequently interchange in conversation, for example, a question predicts an answer and an answer assumes a question, such as congratulation as the utterance function and thanks as the expected response. (McCarthy, 2000). Levinson (1983) states that adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances that contain the first and second parts. Adjacecny pairs also happens at school or university when teacher give a command to student to do the assignment and students obey that command.

#### A conversation is a talking that consist of two people or more. A conversation can refer to people talking with each other just to talk, as a form of 'sociability,' or it can refer to any interactive talk activity, regardless of its purpose (Have, 2007). People engage in conversation for a variety of reasons, including exchanging information, expressing feelings, and maintaining social relationships. People's conversations can be analyzed using conversation analysis. Conversation analysis is a social science approach that seeks to describe, analyze, and comprehend talk as a fundamental and constitutive feature of human social life (Sidnell, 2010).

#### To put it simply, conversation analysis is the study of conversation (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). More specifically, it is the systematic examination of human interaction talk produced in everyday situations: talk-in-interaction. Conversation analysis is a distinct method of analyzing language and social interaction. Its roots can be traced back to the 1960s in sociology, with the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (Wong & Waring, 2010).

#### The speaker and hearer take turns in a conversation, but the implied responses can be varied and even unexpected. Every conversation follows a predictable but not always easy pattern (Wiratno et al., 2018). Adjacency pairs have the following characteristics: 1) composed of two turns, 2) performed by two people, 3) the conversation is divided into first pair parts (FPPs/Fs for short) and second pair parts (SPPs/Ss for short), and 4) pair-type related, which means that not every second pair part follows the first pair part (Schegloff, 2007).

#### In addition, the alternative second pair parts of adjacency pairs do not always have the same status (Levinson in Widyanti, 2017). For example when first speaker blames second speaker, the second speaker can response denial as preferred or admission as dispreferred. There are some common adjacency pairs and some typical preferred and dispreferred part of second pair parts. Those are acceptance as preffered and refusal as dispreferred for request, offer, and invite. Also agreement as preferred and disagreement as dispreferred for assessment, and expected answer as preferred and unexpected answer as dispreferred for question (Sacks as cited in Qodriani & Wijana, 2021). There are 18 types of adjacency pairs as follow: greeting, summon, apology, question, request, offer, blame, command, suggestion, assertion, announcement, assessment, complaint, compliment, invitation, leave-taking, threat, warning (Flowerdew, Levinson, Coulthard, Tylor and Tylor, Paltridge, & Schegloff as cited in Indarti, 2018).

#### However learning English not only can be done in classrooms, but also in virtual meeting since the COVID-19 pandemic occurs. In 2019 to 2022 all countries face the COVID-19 pandemic. Some countries have imposed a total lockdown and some others have restricted the movement of people in activities outside the home. This makes it difficult for many people to carry out their activities and results in changes in the course of various fields of life, one of which is education. Therefore the government enforces online learning from elementary to university levels. Most of learning processes were done through virtual meeting classroom. But it cannot be denied that there are many shortcomings in its implementation. Both teachers and students face issues, such as the availability and sustainability of internet connections, the accessibility of teaching media, and the compatibility of media access tools (Agung et al., 2020).

#### During the COVID-19 pandemic, English classes are held virtually. People avoid face-to-face or physical contact in the COVID-19 era. Teachers and students are all connected at the same time in a virtual class through communication tools or their devices, such as a computer, laptop, or smartphone (Asmara, 2020). Many people will benefit from this, even if it is done virtually. Type of learning that is done online can be a new challenge for all parties involved in the school (Hoang & Le, 2021). In addition, this type of learning can provide a new experience for various parties so that they can prepare more thoroughly. Similar conditions can also occur in the future.

#### An English virtual class is a type of online learning that simulates in-person classes. The only difference between a virtual class and real-world English classes is that is done virtually (Huang & He, 2022). In addition, video conferencing, web conferencing, and Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) are required to make virtual classes effective. There are three critical aspects for the continuity of the English virtual class. The first is interactive whiteboards to make learning more interesting. The second is databases containing various learning materials, such as books, videos, and audio. The third is teacher tools and controls to allow the teachers to make changes. The English virtual class successfully runs.

#### In English online learning, oral comunications is reduced. Teachers and students prefer to have written communications even though oral conversations still occur during virtual meeting by using Zoom or Google Meet platform. According to Qodriani and Wijana (2021, p. 121), verbal communication during the learning and teaching process before COVID-19 hit has now been replaced with written conversations.

#### There have been some studies that discuss about conversation analysis of adjacency pairs in a conversation, especially between teachers and students. The first study is from Indarti (2018) in her article. The data taken is in the form of a recording originating from a recording of the Dynamic Conversation level of adult class interaction at BBC ETS Semarang 2, Tlogosari. This study investigate the adjacency pairs in teaching and learning process between students and the teacher. The result shows the most adjacency pairs used by teacher is questions and also suggest to create more compliment in learning process. The second study is from Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018). This study aims to describe the adjacency pairs in a conversation that done by students and the teacher. The result of this study shows that eleven type of adjacency pairs. The third study is from Rum (2018). The sample of this study is from teacher and students' interaction during learning and teaching process at ELC Education Makassar. The results of this study show five types of adjacency pairs as follows degreeting — degreeting pair which function as agreement to discontinue the conversation, greeting — greeting pair as the same function as the previous, question — refusal pair, offer — refusal, and the last is question — answer pair. The fourth study is from Nafi et al. (2019). The discovery reveals nine types of adjacency pairs formed by the interaction of English teachers and hearing-impaired students. This study also show the dominant role if teachers in the special need classroom.

#### The previous studies, especially conducted in the classroom, show that none of them has investigated adjacency pairs in online or virtual classes. They are still limited to the face-to-face physical world. Reviewing the current phenomenon where learning can be done not physically but also through virtual meetings, the researches conduct this research to analyze conversations between a lecture and students in English virtual classes.

## METHOD

#### The researchers employed a qualitative research methods. This type of research investigates a humanitarian or social problem by focusing on a person as an individual or group (Creswell, 2014). Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2019) defines qualitative research as a research method based on post positivism philosophy that is used to investigate the conditions of natural objects. The researchers employed the technique developed by Have (2007) in terms of the research steps because the data are in the form of words from conversations. These steps were as follows: 1) obtaining or creating recordings of natural interaction, 2) transcribing the tapes in whole or in part, 3) analyzing selected episodes, and 4) reporting the research. Moreover, this research employed textual analysis as an approach for this research.

#### Qualitative research used main data, such as words, actions, or it could also be from other documents (Lofland in Moeloeng, 2013). The primary data of this study were words resulting from transcripts of conversations between a lecturer and students in virtual meetings at Speaking at Workplace Class 2B in Tadris Bahasa Inggris department, IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon. The virtual meeting utilized Zoom platform which lasted 100 minutes or 2 credits at March 30th, 2023.

#### In this study, the researchers acted as an instrument or tool. Therefore, the instrument used was humans because humans can understand words or sentences from a conversation between two or more people. To collect the data the researchers conduct a recording, transcribing, and classifying the data. The collected data were analyzed using textual analysis, to interprete the result of recording, transcribing, and classifying based on theory of adjacency pairs by Indarti (2018) and communicative functions. Textual analysis involved the identification and interpretation of a set of verbal or non-verbal signs (Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009). Since of this study analyzed the conversation that was in part of verbal sign or communication, the researchers employed textual analysis to find out the adjacency pairs and communicative functions in conversations between a lecturer and students in EFL virtual class. For the final report the researchers did not include the analyzed conversation entirely.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### **Adjacency Pairs in EFL Virtual Classes**

#### This study finds 12 types of adjacency pairs. The 12 types of adjacency pairs will be revealed in the table below.

#### **Table 3.1** The distribution of Adjacency Pairs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Types/First Pair Parts | Response/Second Pair Parts | Occurrences |
| 1. | Greeting | Greeting | 5 |
| 2. | Apology | Minimize | 5 |
| 3. | Question | Expected Answer | 44 |
| Unexpected Answer | 21 |
| 4. | Request | Acceptance | 1 |
| Refusal | 0 |
| 5 | Command | Obedience | 44 |
| Disobedience | 5 |
| 6. | Suggestion | Acceptance | 3 |
| Refusal | 2 |
| 7. | Assertion | Agreement | 16 |
| Disagreement | 0 |
| 8. | Announcement | Acknowledgment | 52 |
| 9. | Assessment | Agreement | 7 |
| Disagreement | 0 |
| Opinion | 18 |
| 10. | Complaint | Apology | 6 |
| Non-apology | 2 |
| 11. | Compliment | Acceptance | 2 |
| Refusal | 1 |
| 12. | Leave-taking | Leave-taking | 4 |
| Total | | | 238 |

#### Based on the table above, the researchers finds 238 adjacency pairs produced by the lecturer and students in the virtual English speaking class. This class lasts for 2 credits and is conducted on the Zoom platform. Questions are the most used types of adjacency pairs by a lecturer and students in virtual English speaking class. This is because the lecturer ask many questions to lead the learning process. The findings show that there are a total of 66 questions with a response of 45 for the expected answer and 21 for the unexpected answer. Request becomes the least used with 1 occurrence.

#### In general, this research has similarities with previous research from Indarti (2018) where questions are the most common type of adjacency pairs found in conversations between lecturers or teachers and students. However, there are differences in this study compared to previous research from Indarti (2018), Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019) who respectively investigated the use of adjacency pairs in conversations between lecturers or teachers and students. The difference lies in the response that tends to be passive from the SPPs in responding to the utterances of the FPPs. From a total of 238 adjacency pairs found, there were 41 passive or non-verbal responses that appeared in conversations between lecturers and students.

#### Out of a total of 41 no responses that appears in conversations between lecturer and students in this virtual speaking class, the lecturer never gives no responses to respond to student utterances. Lecturers have an important role as learning centers and lead the course of teaching and learning activities. The reason of students' passivity in online learning is due to a lack of data plan/internet quota (Agung et al., 2020). There are three factors that can cause students to become passive in online learning, such as compulsory task submissions, content courses, and internet connection or data (Sari, 2020). In general non-verbal or passive communication in virtual space can be interpreted as all behavior that has the potential to contain information and does not contain linguistic elements in it (Knapp et al. as cited in Maloney et al., 2020).

#### **Greeting**

#### Greetings can contribute to the learning and teaching process in the classroom (Shields-Lysiak et al., 2020). It is because when teachers, lecturers, fellow students, and all parties at school convey greetings to students, this can make students feel supported, accepted, and safe while they are learning at school so that students become more productive while studying. Greetings were found 5 times which is 3 pairs initiated by lecturer and 2 pairs iniated by students.

#### Data 2

#### Lecturer : *Right. Good morning everyone.*

#### Students : *Good morning, Miss.*

#### In data number 2 above, the lecturer as FPPs immediately initiated the greeting which is commonly used by many people in many countries or even in Indonesia itself. Students as SPPs simply answered greeting by giving good morning back.

#### **Apology**

#### An apology has the goal of maintaining and restoring social norms among human beings so that their relationship remains in good harmony (Goffman as cited in Alfghe & Mohammadzadeh, 2020). Even in English learning class, apology is often used by teachers, lecturers, and students. Apologies can maintain and restore good relations between fellow students, students and teachers, or fellow teachers. There are 5 apologies (1 from lecturer and 4 from students) that occur in conversations between lecturer and students in virtual English speaking class. The response to responding to an apology is to minimize it.

#### Data 209

#### Lecturer : *OK, alright. Thank you, Sanata. I’m so sorry there are so much noises around me here.*

#### Student 19 : *Yes, Miss.*

#### In data 209 it can be seen that the lecturer apologized to the students because there was noise in the place where the lecturer was teaching. The lecturer was worried that the surrounding noise could disrupt the teaching and learning process, so the lecturer apologized to the students. Responding to the lecturer's apology, student 19 immediately answered with the aim of minimizing it.

#### **Question**

#### The total number of questions asked by both lecturer and students was 65 times, where the expected answer was 45 and the unexpected answer was 20. The lecturer initiated the question which resulted in the expected answer response 38 times, while the students 7 times, while for unexpected answers the lecturer and students respectively initiated 10 times.

#### Data 55

#### Lecturer : *OK, yeah, uh, can you guys see my screen?*

#### Student 1 : *Yes, Miss*.

#### In data 55 student 1 has a clear answer and is in accordance with what was asked by the lecturer so it is considered as expected answer. The lecturer asks or clarifies all students whether the share screen can be seen, student 1 automatically answers briefly and clearly that the share screen has appeared. The example of unexpected answer will be shown below.

#### Data 62

#### Lecturer : *Thank you. OK, so what is the meaning of the first word ‘cub’? What is cub? Anyone knows? Cub? The first word. What is the meaning of the first word cub?*

#### Student 1 : *Cub?*

#### In data 62, the lecturer asks the students if they know what the word 'cub' means in Indonesian. The response that came was from student 1 where he asked back with "cub?" This response has an ambiguous meaning whether he knows or does not know the meaning of the word 'cub' so this is categorized as an unexpected answer.

#### The previous research from Indarti (2018), Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019), respectively has pairs of finding questions that get verbal responses. Whereas in Indarti's research (2018), the question pairs found in this study contained non-verbal responses or through gestures. Question pairs in Indarti's research (2018) showed smilling and nodding the head gestures from students to answer questions from the teacher. The findings of the previous studies have similarities with this current study in that data on 16 where the lecturer asked a question to a student but this student and the others did not reply. There was no response from the students indicating that the student whose name was mentioned was not present at this virtual meeting. It can be considered that non-verbal responses exist in virtual conversations and can be understood by speakers of both FPPs and SPPs.

#### **Request**

#### When the FPPs ask to SPPs to do something in polite manner it is called request. To respond this type of adjacency pairs, the SPPs can accept it or refuse it. Only 1 request that found in the conversation between a lecturer and students in this study. The response is acceptance.

#### Data 189

#### Lecturer : *Alright. Sanata, can you share your screen about your visualization?*

#### Student 19 : *Yes. Wait, Miss.*

#### In the data above, the lecturer requests student 19 to immediately display a share screen regarding the visualization of a story. The response from student 19 was to carry out a request from the lecturer so that this is categorized as acceptance which is the preferred answer.

#### **Command**

#### This type of adjacency command is very commonly produced in an English class, such as when a teacher gives orders to students to read sentences on certain pages, do assignments, or commands can also occur when students give orders to teachers to announce exam results and so on. There were 49 commands (45 initiated by lecturer and 4 initiated by students) produced in the conversation between a lecturer and students in the speaking class which had a response of 44 for obedience as the preferred answer and 5 for disobedience as the preferred answer.

#### Data 187

#### Lecturer : *Give applause everyone, for Faiza.*

#### Students : [no response verbally but gesturally].

#### Data 187 shows students obey orders from the lecturer by action or gesture instead of verbally. Even though there are different ways to respond, it can be interpreted as an obedience or preferred answer because the adjacency pairs response does not have to be in the form of saying Yes or No (Mudra, 2018). The example disobedience will be shown below.

#### Data 210

#### Lecturer : *OK. So you may close your presentation.*

#### Student 19 : *Enough, Miss?*

#### In data 210, the lecturer ordered student 19 to close the presentation. Student 19 did not immediately respond by agreeing or closing the presentation, instead Student 19 made sure whether the presentation was sufficient even though the lecturer had ordered from the start to close the presentation.

#### The finding of previous research from Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019) there were no command pairs, whereas in Indarti's (2018) study command pairs appeared and were produced by teachers and students. Command pairs in Indarti's research (2018) obtained verbal responses from students in answering commands from the teacher. Whereas in this current study, apart from verbal responses in response to commands, there were also non-verbal responses or through gestures to answer commands. In data 187 the response from students did not contain linguistic elements but through body language or gestures. The gesture expressed by the students is in accordance with the command from the lecturer, namely by giving a round of applause to one of the other students. This response is considered as obedience because it has followed the command from the lecturer.

#### **Suggestion**

#### Suggestion is different from command in that a suggestion contains suggestions from the FPPs' opinion, while a command is an order that tends to be more urgent and must be carried out. To respond to this type of adjacency pairs the SPPs can accept or refuse. There are 5 suggestions (all produced by lecturer) found from conversations between a lecture and students where 3 were for the response to accept as the preferred answer and 2 to refuse as the dispreferred answer.

#### Data 191

#### Lecturer : *Maybe you can try again to share your screen.*

#### Student 19 : *Yes, Miss, wait.*

#### In data 191 shows an acceptance response. The context in this case, before suggesting student 19 to display the share screen, student 19 had a technical problem where he could not share the screen. The lecturer also made student 19 a co-host first and then the lecturer suggested student 19 to try again to show the screen. Suggestions from lecturer is accepted and implemented by students 19. The example of refusal will be shown below.

#### Data 15

#### Lecturer : *Maybe you can turn on your camera when I pull up your name.*

#### Student 4 : [no response verbally and gesturally].

#### Data 15 is an example of suggestions from lecturer as FPPs that is refused by students. In data 15 when the lecturer checks student attendance, the lecturer suggests student 4 to turn on the camera when his/her name is called. However, student 4 did not turn on the camera immediately or answer verbally so it is considered as refusal.

#### The previous research from Indarti (2018), Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019) did not find suggestions pairs. However, in this study suggestions pairs occurs 5 times. In answering suggestions, student respond by giving verbal and nonverbal response or gesturally. In data 15, the utterances from the lecturer is suggestion while that from student 4 is refusal. In responding to suggestion from the lecturer, student 4 did not respond with utterances, such as “Yes, Miss” or “I can't turn on my camera, Miss” to show acceptance or refusal. Student 4 gave a response in the form of body language where student 4 did not follow the lecturer's suggestion to turn on the camera. Therefore, the response from student 4 is considered as a refusal.

#### **Assertion**

#### Assertion is a statement produced by the FPPs where they feel what they convey is true. To respond to an assertion, the SPPs can give an agreement as a preferred answer and disagreement as a dispreferred answer. In total there are 16 assertions (12 times from lecturer and 4 times from students) where all the responses are in the form of agreement as the preferred answer.

#### Data 227

#### Student 1 : *Yeah, after Jack grows and then he always racist to his mother.*

#### Lecturer : *Yeah. So he blames everything bad happened to him to his mother. OK, and then he only cares about himself.*

#### Data 227 shows the assertion expressed by student 1. Student 1's assertion regarding the actions of a character in a story was agreed by the lecturer by providing additional details about the bad actions of a story character named Jack towards his mother.

#### The previous research from Indarti (2018), Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019) do not find assertion of adjacency pairs. However, this current study finds assertion pairs and its response. In data 7 shows the lecturer's utterance is assertion, while the students' utterances is agreement. Even though the students did not respond at all to the lecturer's assertion, their silence could be interpreted as agreement because they did not question or refute it.

#### **Announcement**

#### Announcement is a statement where someone simply gives information about something (Widyanti, 2017). For example, the teacher provides information regarding exam schedule, what material will be studied at the next meeting, or what items must be prepared for speaking practice. To respond this, someone gives acknowledgment. In total there were 52 adjacency pairs of announcement uttered by lecturer and students where lecturer initiated 36 times while students initiated 16 times.

#### Data 12

#### Lecturer : *OK. So you are also at campus building. OK. But today we have our meeting online. So thank you for accommodating this online meeting. Unfortunately, but for next week we are going to have our meeting offline as usual. OK. Alright. So I’m going to take your attendance first.*

#### Students : [no response].

#### In data 12 above the lecturer provides information about learning that is carried out online. The lecturer also provides information for the next meeting which will be held offline again. In addition, the lecturer also informed students that the lecturer would check student attendance first. All announcements initiated by lecturer do not receive verbal answers from students. Conversations in virtual space tend to be passive. For instance, the lecturer gives students information about the next meeting, the students kept silent, indicating that they receive the information. The absence of a student response can be interpreted as an acknowledgment. This also means that while students do not refute or ask for announcements from the lecturer it shows that they understand and can follow the next information.

#### The previous research from Indarti (2018), Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018), Rum (2018) do not find announcement pairs. Meanwhile in Nafi et al. (2019) announcement or giving information exists. To response to announcement, the hearing-impairment students response with verbal and sign language. This also occurs in this study where the response both can be verbal, gesture, or silence. In data 118, the speech produced by the lecturer is an announcement, while no response from students is considered as an acknowledgment. The reason why no verbal response and gestures from students is categorized as acknowledgments is because students do not refute, question, protest, or stop the lecturer's speech which means they understand and can follow further information.

#### **Assessment**

#### When someone produces utterances that describe feelings, judgments, or evaluations of other people, events, or objects, then that person is doing an assessment (Isgianto, 2016). Assessment can also be in the form of a question where FPPs aim to seek opinions or evaluation from SPPs. In adjacency pairs, to respond to an assessment in the form of a statement the SPPs can give an agreement or disagreement, whereas if the assessment is in the form of a question then the SPPs can answer it with an opinion. The findings show that there are a total of 25 assessments (18 time from lecturer and 7 times from students) where the responses are divided into 7 for agreement and 18 for opinion.

#### Data 184

#### Lecturer : *A Chinese-American man. And he has difficulties in finding his place, right? Whether he is American or he is Chinese. OK, so there are cultural differences between Chinese and America, right? So this is a case of racism, right?*

#### Student 21 : *Yes, Miss.*

#### In data 184 above the lecturer gave her comments regarding the problem of racism that occurs in a story. Responding to assessment from lecturer, student 21 gave his aggreement. This is considered the preferred answer. The example of opinio response will be shown below.

#### Data 224

#### Lecturer : *OK, alright, so what do you think, Arya, about Jack’s character?*

#### Student 1 : *I think he’s cruel character and then selfish.*

#### The example above is how an assessment can be in the form of a question and have a opinion to respond it. In the case in data 224, the lecturer asked student 1's opinion on Jack's character, student 1 answered that Jack is a cruel character and he is selfish.

#### **Complaint**

#### Complaint is a statement that describes a person's dissatisfaction with something or the actions of another person (Godard as cited in Aropi et al., 2022). In adjacency pairs, to respond to the FPPs complaint, the SPPS can say apology. The researcher found adjacency pairs of this type 8 times (1 time initiead by lecturer and 7 times initiated by students) in conversation at English speaking class.

#### Data 196

#### Lecturer : *I want to present. I want to present, not I want to presentation, yeah, or maybe, uh. So make sure I want to plus verb one, present, yeah, Sanata, yeah. Just, just, just, just, uh, just speak what is in your mind. No problem, we learn together.*

#### Student 19 : *Yes*.

#### In data 196, it can be seen that the lecturer's dissatisfaction with the students' incorrect grammar was evident. This expression of dissatisfaction can be considered as a complaint. In answering the complaint from the lecturer, student 19 gave approval to the lecturer so that the answer from student 19 can be categorized as an apology. The example of non-apology will be shown below.

#### Data 140

#### Student 1 : *Adelia, how did you feel about the main character? Hello? Ini kayak, kayak, ngomong sendiri gak, sih?* [I feel like I’m talking to myself].

#### Student 8 : *Hey, di sini suaranya bentrok* [The sound here is clashes].

#### In data 140, student 1 expressed his dissatisfaction with his fellow students because he had started the discussion but did not get an active response from other fellow students. The complaint initiated by student 1 did not receive an apology from other fellow students but instead a statement denying that the sound heard on the device was unstable. The response from student 8 can be considered as a non-apology. The response apology can be shown as accepting the complaint or immediately taking action.

#### The previous research from Indarti (2018), Rum (2018), and Nafi et al. (2019) do not find complaint pairs. Meanwhile in Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018) the complaint pairs exist. The students in Widiyastuti and Rustono (2018) always give response verbally. Meanwhile in this study, to respond to complaint pairs, the students answer verbally, gesturally, and silently. In data 14, student 1 gave a complaint to student because student 3 was very noisy during the discussion session. Responding to the complaint from student 1, the student immediately became silent and did not respond verbally with an apology. Even without a verbal response, this is considered an apology because student 3's actions follow what student 1 complained about.

#### **Compliment**

#### A compliment is an utterance that has a positive tone to a person's appearance, personality, abilities, characteristics, and possessions (Alsuhaibani, 2022). Compliment also has a very important purpose in social life as a tool to strengthen and form social bonds. This can also be a strategy as a form of politeness. In learning English, compliments can improve students' communication skills and can be used as access for students to have the opportunity to understand how other cultures convey praise and respond to it (Dilnozakhon, 2022). In adjacency pairs, to response to compliment is by giving an acceptance or refusal. The findings show the results of compliments 3 times (all initiated by lecturer) where the response is 2 as acceptance and 1 as refusal.

#### Data 180

#### Lecturer : *Oh, yeah. You, you are quite good in drawing.*

#### Student 21 : *Thank you.*

#### Data 217

#### Lecturer : *Oh, yeah, Sanata did really well in visualizing the memorable secene, yeah.*

#### Student 19 : *Yes, Miss.*

#### In both data 180 and 217 above it shows that the compliment initiated by the lecturer has been received by the students. Acceptance can be in the form of thanks or approval. In data 180, student 21 received a compliment from the lecturer with thanks, while in data 217 it was seen that student 19 received a compliment from the lecturer with approval. Both are considered as acceptance or preferred answer. The example of refusal as disprefferred answer will be shown below.

#### Data 51

#### Lecturer : *Sanata? OK, our Ariana.*

#### Student 19 : *I’m not Ariana.*

#### In the data above the lecturer gives a compliment to student 19 that she is Ariana, in this case referring to the famous singer Ariana Grande. However, the compliment from the lecturer was casually refused by student 19.

#### **Leave-Taking**

#### Greeting is produced when the FPPs opens a conversation, while leave-taking is produced to end a conversation (Paltridge in Widyanti, 2017). To answer a leave-taking utterance, the SPPs do another leave-taking. A total of 4 leave-taking utterances have been produced by lecturer and students in the virtual English speaking class.

#### Data 238

#### Lecturer : *OK, see you everyone.*

#### Students : *See you, Miss.*

## CONCLUSION

#### The researchers conclude there are 238 adjacency pairs which are categorized into 12 types of adjacency pairs based on the findings of this study. Each type of adjacency pairs are: 1) 5 greeting pairs, 2) 5 apology pairs with response minimize, 3) 65 question pairs whose responses are divided into 44 for expected answers and 21 for unexpected answers, 4) 1 request pairs with response acceptance, 5) 49 command pairs whose response is divided into 44 for obedience and 5 for disobediences, 6) 5 suggestion pairs whose response is divided into 3 for acceptance and 2 for refusal, 7) 16 assertion pairs with response agreements, 8) 52 announcement pairs with response acknowledgment, 9) 25 assessment pairs whose response is divided into 7 for agreements and 25 for opinions, 10) 8 complaint pairs whose response is divided into 6 for apologies and 2 for non-apologies, 11) 3 compliment pairs whose responses is divided into 2 acceptances and 1 for refusal, and 12) 4 leave-taking pairs. The question pairs become the most applied adjacency pairs by the lecturer and the students because this is a way to interact in an online class. This interaction mostly initiated by the lecturer indicating that the lecturer has dominant role in learning process and become the center of learning. Meanwhile for communicative functions there are 432 communicative functions which are categorized into 5 types of communicative functions based on the findings of this study. Each type of communicative functions are: 1) 61 referential functions, 2) 21 emotive functions, 3) 153 conative functions, 4) 168 phatic functions, and 5) 29 metalinguistic functions. Phatic functions become the most used communicative functions types followed by conative indicating that the interactions between the lecturer and students go well. This research contributes to conversational analysis of adjacency pairs theory because it analyzes the conversations between a lecturer and students in English virtual class.
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