

Conversational Analysis on Adjacency Pairs Occurred in Teaching and Learning English of Intellectual Disability Classroom: A Descriptive Study at a Special Needs School

Dita Etik Setiani¹, Erna Wardani², Nisa Roiyasa³

^{1,2,3}Jendral Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Indonesia

ditaetiks.0408@gmail.com, erna.wardani@unsoed.ac.id, nroiyasa@unsoed.ac.id

Abstract

This research aimed to investigate the most types of adjacency pairs that occurred in the conversation in 12th grade students with intellectual disability. This research also focused on how the teacher used the adjacency pairs on the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Using descriptive qualitative methods, the data were collected by recording the conversation, observation, and teacher interview. The participants of this research are the teacher and the 12th grade students of Special Needs School C and C1 Yakut Purwokerto that consist of 15 students. The findings reveal that 5 types of adjacencies pair out of 11 types occurred: question-answer (51 pairs), greeting-greeting (2 pairs), request-acceptance (3 pairs), assessment-agreement (3 pairs), and leave-taking (1 pair). Among these pairs, question-answer adjacency pairs were the most prevalent, occurring 51 times throughout the conversation. These pairs played a vital role in maintaining student engagement and supporting communication in the classroom. Students with intellectual disability responded to the teacher with preferred answers, which means that they were able to follow the teacher's prompts, but they struggled to initiate the conversation first. The analysis further highlights the importance of adjacency pairs used by the teacher in creating a supportive environment in which students can participate more actively.

Keywords: Conversational Analysis, Adjacency Pairs, Teaching and Learning, Intellectual Disability.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui jenis pasangan ujaran terdekat yang paling banyak terjadi dalam percakapan siswa kelas 12 dengan disabilitas intelektual. Penelitian ini juga berfokus pada bagaimana guru menggunakan pasangan ujaran terdekat dalam proses belajar dan mengajar di kelas. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif, data diperoleh melalui rekaman percakapan di kelas, observasi dan wawancara dengan guru. Peserta penelitian ini adalah guru dan siswa kelas 12 dari Sekolah Luar Biasa C dan C1 Yakut Purwokerto yang terdiri dari 15 siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terdapat 5 jenis pasangan ujaran terdekat dari 11 jenis yang ada, yaitu: tanya-jawab (51 pasangan) salam-salam (2 pasangan), permintaan-penerimaan (3 pasangan), penilaian-persetujuan (3 pasangan), dan perpisahan. Pasangan tanya-jawab adalah yang paling sering terjadi, yaitu muncul sebanyak 51 kali. Pasangan-pasangan ini memainkan peran penting dalam menjaga keterlibatan siswa dalam pembelajaran dan mendukung komunikasi di dalam kelas. Siswa dengan disabilitas intelektual bisa menjawab dengan benar pertanyaan guru dan mampu mengikuti percakapan guru, tetapi mereka kesulitan untuk memulai percakapan terlebih dahulu. Pasangan ujaran terdekat penting digunakan oleh guru dalam menciptakan lingkungan yang mendukung di mana siswa dapat berpartisipasi lebih aktif.

Kata Kunci: Analisis Percakapan, Pasangan Ujaran Terdekat, Belajar dan Mengajar, Disabilitas Intelektual.

INTRODUCTION

Conversation is one of the most common human languages used to communicate. Conversation is a way for people to socialize, develop and maintain relationships with each other. In its simplest context, conversation means using language for the informal exchange of

mind, ideas and information, or for expressing thoughts, opinions and feelings (Al-Khaza'leh, 2022). A world of conversation turns into one world by sharing something (specific thoughts, landscapes, poems, or stories) we enter the world together and we become this world (Shuying Li, 2016). The conversations also

needed in teaching and learning process to exchange information between teacher and students, as Ruiguang Li (2021) stated that teacher-student interaction is one of the most vital components of successful teaching. Those factors stimulate students' achievement, motivation, and engagement, with student engagement in particular appearing to be a key component for academic achievement. Based on those evidences, it can be concluded that interactive conversation is one of the keys to reach the learning goals.

Considering the essential role of conversation in human social life, it is crucial to know conversation as a language activity, and from 1960s, conversation analysis has been emphasized as a subject of study (Liddicoat, 2007). Conversational analysis (CA) is an approach to discourse analysis that looks at how people manage their usual conversation interactions, and it examines how spoken speech is arranged and developed as speakers interact (Paltridge, 2008).

Conversation is a type of discourse. Thus, conversational analysis may be viewed as a subfield of discourse analysis. Benghorbal, (2017) said that in conversational analysis, a wide range of elements of conversation has been discussed. Such as turn taking, pauses, overlap, and adjacency pairs. In this research, the researcher analysed the adjacency pairs that happened in the classroom interaction. Adjacency pair is a sequence of turns in a conversation and some turns more closely related than others (Sacks & Schegloff, 1973). Furthermore, Sacks and Schegloff also explained that Adjacency pairs appeared in daily conversation including in greetings and farewells, in which the initiating speaker expects the recipient to give a hello or goodbye response, respectively.

An adjacency pairs is created of two utterances by two speakers, one after the other. The first utterances or the first pairs stimulate a respond of the

hearer/second speaker utterances. The second utterance or second pair part is utterance in which responds the first utterance done by the initiator (Yule, 1996).

For example:

First pair part (FPP)

A: *Hello.*

A: *How are you?*

A: *What time is it?*

Second pair part (SPP)

B: *Hi*

B: *I'm fine.*

B: *It's 3 o'clock.*

In the example above, A is the first pair part and B is the second pair part. Those two utterances are related to each other. A initiates a conversation and B is a response to A. The response of the second part in adjacency pairs depends on the first part, and the two parts must fit together in a coherent way.

Adjacency pairs can appear in every class, as long as there is a conversation within the class, including the intellectual disability classroom. According to Shree & Shukla (2016), the definition of intellectual disability belongs to a child's level of cognitive function. Cognitive function is a condition in which a child's cognitive function is impaired, creating considerable difficulties in gathering information from the environment, processing it, problem solving, and adapting to it. The earlier term of intellectual disability is mental retardation. According to Boat & Wu (2015), every person who is or was qualified for a mental retardation diagnostic is also qualified for an intellectual disability. The ability to respond to a speaker in conversation of intellectual disability people with normal people is so different. The following example illustrates the conversation in mentally retarded person taken from Rahmah, Syihabuddin, Sudana, and Gunawan (2022):

A (normal people): *Wis adus during koe?*

(Have you taken a bath?)

B (retarded people): *Sudah (Yes)* (affluently pronounce, with laughing and unnor-

acting, then entering pointing finger to mouth).

From the example above, the mental retarded person answered the question like a normal person but followed by laughing and abnormal acting then entering pointing finger. It indicates that the mental retarded person understood the question of the normal person. This statement is in line with Ogletree, Bartholomew, Wagaman, Genz, & Reisinger (2012) that intellectual disability people frequently develop physical action such as hand movement, head movement, and facial expression with limited speech and language abilities. It can be seen that the way people with intellectual disability are different from normal people. They are having difficulties in understanding what people say and in expressing their feelings and the teacher as a normal person has to conduct an effective communication in the classroom.

Based on the previous explanation, the researcher is attracted to utilize conversational analysis to investigate the usage of adjacency pairs in English subject in the intellectual disability classroom because adjacency pairs have been widely studied, but the research in classrooms with intellectual disability students remains under-study. This study fills that gap by focusing specifically on this unique educational context. The participants of this research will be the 12th graders at the special need school in Purwokerto. The research intentions are to define the various types of adjacency pairs that occur in the classroom, the patterns, and the structure of this pairs through the analysis of recorded classroom conversations and understanding how the use of adjacency pairs in the classroom by teacher. By analysing the pairs may help teachers plan their lessons and interactions in order to facilitate good teaching and learning. Furthermore, analysing adjacency pairs in the classroom will show effective communication in the classroom and give

solutions for problems in teaching and learning communication.

METHODOLOGY

This research used a descriptive qualitative methodology. Qualitative research is a way to see and understand how individuals or groups deal with social or human problems. In this research, the researcher investigated the researcher investigated the adjacency pairs during the teaching and learning process in the intellectual disability classroom and the researcher believes that descriptive qualitative is suitable to report the detailed information of the adjacency pairs found in the intellectual disability classroom and also explain how the adjacency pairs are used by the teacher in conducting the English lesson.

This research conducted in Sekolah Luar Biasa (SLB) Yakut C dan C1 Purwokerto. this school was suitable for the topic of this research because this school specializes in educating students with intellectual disabilities, which aligns with this research focus on communication patterns and adjacency pairs in classrooms catering to this specific population. The school also open to educational research makes smooth collaboration between the researcher and the institution.

The population of this research, was all students and the teacher in 12th grade of Sekolah Menengah Atas Luar Biasa (SMALB) academic year 2023/2024 which consist of 15 students. For the sample, the researcher took all the population as a sample. Sugiyono (2013) said that total sampling is done when the total population is small less than 30 people. Based on the total population which only consist of 15 students, the researcher selects all the population become the sample of this study, besides there is only one 12th grade class in SLB Yakut C dan C1 Purwokerto. There were three data collection methods in this research. They were audio recording of the conversation, interview with the

teacher and observation during the learning activity.

Recording in conversational analysis has an aim to preserve the temporality sequentially, and ecology of the participants' activities (Hoey & Kendrick, 2018). In addition, Wong and Waring (2010) CA requires naturally occurring data that has been recorded and transcribed. Naturally occurring data should be an audio or video recorded in order to retain as much of an emic perspective as possible on activities as they are naturally organized by the participants. Based on that, the researcher collected the audio recording of the conversation during teaching and learning process in the classroom. After that, the researcher transcribed the conversation from the recording into written form without making any correction or changes. Next, the data identified and classified based on the theory of adjacency pairs.

Observation is an activity to make field notes of people's behavior and activity at the research site (Creswell, 2014). The researcher conducted the observation four times on 28/03/2024, 22/04/24, 23/04/24, 25/04/24. The aim of observation is to provide a deeper understanding of the subject. The observation data was used to find out the students' behavior and how adjacency pairs are used by the teacher in conducting the teaching and learning process. The researcher used an observation sheet and taking notes on what the researcher witness.

Researcher conducted the interviews to support data recording and observation. Interviews are a method of finding data from people as subjects (Kumar, 2011). The researcher interviewed a teacher who teaches English subject in 12th grade.

The researcher applied the triangulation method to validate the data. Miles and Huberman (2014) explained that there are five kinds of triangulation in qualitative research; triangulation by data

source, triangulation by method, triangulation by researcher, triangulation by theory, and triangulation by data type. The researcher used triangulation by method in this study by using audio recording, interview, and observation as the data collection technique.

In this research, the data gained from the conversation in the intellectual disability classroom were analysed using conversational analysis. Cohen et al. (2018) defines that "conversational analysis is one type of discourse analysis, looking at a conversation between two or more people in a specific context, examining what they say, how they say it, for what reasons or purposes, and using what kinds of interaction, sequences, contexts and structures in the conversation". Moreover, Ten Have (1999) in Mezmir, (2020) stated that there are four steps for research projects using conversation analysis as a method: first, getting or making recordings of natural interaction, second transcribing the tapes, in completely or in part, and then analysing selected episodes and the last is reporting the research.

The data from interview and observation were analysed with descriptive analysis. In other words, the data gained from the observation would be elaborated descriptively in order to get the deep and clear information about the real situations happened during the teaching and learning process. As stated by Loeb et al. (2017) that the goal of descriptive analysis is to identify and describe the key phenomena and characteristic of related topic. By analysing descriptively, it would be known the intellectual disability student's behaviour and how the teacher handles the class. Moreover, the researcher also rechecked all off the instruments in order to find out if those all instruments were matched each other.

FINDING(S) AND DISCUSSION FINDINGS

This section examines, reveals and

discusses the data found from audio recording, observation and interview sessions. The analysis is done to provide direct responses to the research questions. Researcher recorded the conversation that occurred in the class between the teacher and the students. Then, the recording was transcribed and classified into the types of adjacency pairs. The researcher classified them based on the types of adjacency pairs according to Paltridge theory (2000). There were 11 types of adjacency pairs. Those are Requesting-acceptance, Assessment-agreement, Question-answer, Compliment-acceptance, Leave-taking, Complaint-apology, Greeting-greeting, Warning-acknowledgement, Blame-denial, Threat-counter threat and Offer-Acceptance.

There were 5 types of Adjacency Pairs out of 11 found in this research. Those types are Requesting-Acceptance, Assessment-agreement, Question-answer, Compliment-acceptance, Leave taking adjacency pair, Complaint-apology, Greeting-greeting, Warning-acknowledgement, Blame-denial, Threat-counter threat and Offer-Acceptance. Here is the table of adjacency pairs found in this research:

Table 1:
Adjacency Pair Types

No	Adjacency Pair Types	Amount
1.	Greetings-greetings	2
2.	Question-answer	51
3.	Request-acceptance	3
4.	Assessment-agreement	3
5.	Leave-taking	1

Interview were conducted with the teacher. The interview conducted to get information about the condition of the class and the perspective from the teacher also the strategy based on the teacher experiences in communication with students. Eleven questions were asked to

the teacher related to the interaction between the teacher and the students in the classroom. The interview found that the students are able to doing interaction with teacher and among the students, even though their answer sometimes unconnected with the topic discussed, especially with the students that have severe intellectual disability. Moreover, the teacher revealed that she has to begin the conversation first and often asks questions to the students because if the teacher not doing that the class will be silent.

Observations were carried out by the researcher in the classroom of the 12th-grade students of SMALB C and C1 Yakut Purwokerto. Researcher observed the activities during the teaching and learning process. Observation was carried out for 4 times on 28/03/2024, 22/04/24, 23/04/24, 25/04/24. In the observation, there were 13 checklists with four observation focuses. The focuses were the teacher's input, students' responses, students' interaction, and students' nonverbal cues.

From the day 1 until day 4 the teacher always gives explanation, questions and asks requests to the students. The students also give good responses to the teacher, pay attention to the teacher and doing what the teacher ask. Even though some students who have severe disability only follow their friends when answering the questions and cannot pay attention to the teacher. The observation demonstrates that the students have positive interactions with the teacher. The teacher asked the student one by one and almost all of the students actively answering the questions from the teacher. The interaction among the student also positively happened, the student actively doing little conversation with each other. When the students doing interaction, they showed happy faces when they were talking and they keep showing their teeth. Moreover, the students often move their hands to more express themselves when speaking.

DISCUSSION

The researcher would like to discuss the data that answer the problem statements in the discussion section. The primary objectives of this study related to the most used types of adjacency pairs in the classroom conversation and how the teacher used adjacency pair in conducting the English Class.

The Most Used Types of Adjacency Pairs

Based on the findings of the conversation, there are only 5 types of Adjacency Pairs out of 11 found in this research. Those types are Request-Acceptance (3), Assessment-agreement (3), Question-answer (51), Leave-taking (1), Greeting-greeting (2).

The most used pair is question-answer with 51 pairs found by the researcher. There were 48 preferred responses and only 3 pairs that dispreferred the response. Teachers often use questions to engage students to be more active in class, check for understanding, and prompt responses. Based on the interview, the teacher also stated that the teacher frequently asks questions in the classroom because if the teacher does not do that, the students will remain quiet. From the observation, the researcher also found that the teacher initiated the conversation first and the students barely asked questions to the teacher. Since the question and answer is the most frequent pair used by the teacher, it indicates that the students are hardly able to begin the conversation but can understand what the teacher said. As a result, these findings are in line with Rahmah et al. (2022) that, conversation activities carried out by normal people with mentally retarded people are in the form of questions asked by the interlocutor (normal people) first. For example:

T: Kita masuk ke materi Sebelum kita masuk ke materi, saya mau nanya nih, kalian punya gak Buah favorit? (Before we begin the lesson, I want

to ask a question. Do you have a favorite fruit?) S: Punya punya (I have, I have)

T: Okey coba satu-satu. An, apa buah favoritnya? (Okay, one by one. An, what's your favourite fruit?

An: Apel (Apple)

T: Terus yang lain? (then, the other?)

LS: Mangga (mango)

T: Terus lagi? (then, another)

(The students able to answer the teacher's question and competing to answer the questions. Some students with moderate disabilities only listen and follow the words of their friends)

The example above proved that the teacher (normal people) kept asking questions to the intellectual disability students. The teacher keeps asking questions to encourage active participation of the students and make the students involved in the learning process.

One of the characteristics of intellectual disability people is they have problem with speech and communication skills as a stated by Boat and Wu (2015) that they typically have physical limitations and have poor communication skills. This characteristic also found in this intellectual disability students that have struggle to start dialogue or ask question with others. As a result, some of the students in this class might appear passive or they have difficulties in social interactions, even when they have the desire to connect with others. In addition, intellectual disability students barely open up the conversation because people with intellectual disability have poor communication skills and limited ability to communicate with others. Furthermore, Doggett et al. (2013) as cited in Chezan (2020) found that students with ID have challenges in the ability to initiate, maintain, and terminate conversations, individuals with ID also engage in a limited number of self-initiated social interactions compared to typical peers.

How the Teacher Used the Adjacency

Pairs

The second objective of this research was to identify and analyze the adjacency pairs used by the teacher in the classroom. This section shows the results regarding how the teacher uses the of adjacency pairs in the classroom. As mentioned before, five types of adjacency pairs were found in the teaching and learning process in the 12th grade students with intellectual disability.

Greetings-Greetings were used by the teacher to create a warm and welcoming atmosphere and to gain the students' attention at the beginning of the class. As said by (Yule (1996) greeting-greeting is typically found in the opening sequences of a conversation. The teacher opened the class by greeting the students with two kinds of greetings, below are the turn taking of greeting and greeting found in the class:

Teacher: Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh

Students: Waalaikummusallam Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh.

Teacher: Selamat pagi semuanya (Good morning, everyone)

Students: Pagi (morning)

(The students fluently answering the greetings from the teacher like a normal students)

Greetings were also used as a signal that the class would be started and make the students focus to begin the learning activity. The students simply gave attention to the teacher after the teacher greeted them. This finding also in line with the study from Fenyi & Nyarkoh (2022) that greeting-greeting is usually used by the teachers to open their class sessions with pleasantries. These pleasantries served as the □opening□ and psychological conditioning of the students to prepare themselves for the lesson.

Question-Answer was considered as the most adjacency pairs utterance by the teacher. The teacher mostly uses questions to make the students active in the

classroom. Moreover, the teacher uses this pair to gain attention from the students. For example, can be seen in the conversation below.:

T: Wu, Wu apa yang gak suka? (Wu, what do you dislike?)

T: Wu? Apa?(Wu? What?)

Wu: apel (apple)

(Student Wu was busy with himself and did not pay attention to the teacher when he was asked, so the teacher needed to repeat the question to Wu with a bit of emphasis on her voice. Then Wu answered loudly and then laughed)

From the conversation above, the first question the teacher asked Student Wu about his favorite fruit, but the teacher did not receive a response from Student Wu. After a few seconds, the teacher asked Wu again, but with an emphasis on the voice when asking and calling his name. After the second question, with a slight emphasis on the teacher's tone, Wu answered the teacher's question. The teacher's emphasis on the voice was intended to gain Wu's attention, as he had previously not been paying attention to the teacher. This finding in line with the explanation from Williams (2023) that a question that comes with an answer is used not only to clarify meaning, but also to indicate the participants' involvement in the conversation.

Question and answer also used by the teacher to check the students' readiness to start the lesson. The pair found in this research is:

Teacher: Sudah siap belajar? (Are you ready to study?)

Students: Enggaa (No)

(Students answered the teacher loudly with smiling)

This adjacency pair reflects a moment of interaction where the teacher is checking on the students' readiness, but the students answered it with dispreferred response. The students answered it with laughter, it means that they are unserious about the answer, so the teacher still

continue the lesson.

Requests-Acceptances occurred three times in this research. All of them are preferred response, but only one pair answered with an utterance and the rest students answered with the action. According to Sidnell (2010) Conversation analysis, on the other hand, examines the relation between practices of speaking and actions-in-talk within sequences. Sidnell also explored that gestures, facial expressions, and other bodily movements contribute to the performance and interpretation of actions in conversation. It means that the actions shown by the student are important being the part of the conversation itself.

In his classroom all of them were used by the teacher to instruct students to do some activities as explained by Goddard (2011) in Aropi (2022) request-acceptance is happened when one person (the speaker) asks the other person (the hearer) to do something, and the second pair response with acceptance.

Moreover, in this case, a request from the teacher also indicated a transition between the activities. For example,
Teacher: "Bisa dikeluarkan bukunya? (Please take out your books)"
(The students take out their books and start writing)

(After the teacher makes a request, the students directly do what the teacher said)

The teacher requesting the students to take out their books indirectly indicates an activity transition from the beginning of the class or introduction to the main learning activities.

Assessment-Agreement happen when first speaker expresses an opinion, feeling, judgment, or evaluation about something, and the second speaker responds with agreement or disagreement as stated by Liddicoat (2007) that assessments are turns which provide an evaluation and evaluation might positive or negative. There were two pairs of assessment-agreement and one pair of

assessment-disagreement found in this research. The assessment is expressed by the teacher to know the reason behind the statements made by the students. Below is the pair of assessment-agreement:

T: Terus yang lain? (Then, the others?) Ls: Aku durian (I don't like durian)

T: Kenapa? Bau yah (Why? It is smelly, isn't it?)

Ls: iya bau (yes, it is smelly)

(Student Ls answered the teacher well and showed an enthusiasm expression towards her answer. According to the teacher, student Ls is classified as a student with mild disabilities, so Ls have a quite good communication ability)

The context is that the teacher asks the students about a fruit they dislike, and after the student answers with the fruit she likes, the teacher responds with a first pair of assessment "Kenapa? Bau yah (Why? It is smelly, isn't it?) " and the students agreed with the teacher by saying "yes".

Leave-taking is the ending of an interaction in the class, the teacher uses this pair to close the lesson. As what Fenyi & Nyarkoh (2022) found that Leave-taking is a pattern that used to indicate that the classroom interaction between the teacher and the students has ended and, therefore, students are to prepare for the next teacher, go out for break or close from school. In this Research, teacher finished the class and expressed thanking to the students. After that, the teacher ended it by giving leave-taking wassalamualaikum warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh to the students and the student responded it also with the expression of leave-taking wa alaikumussalam wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh. Below is the complete conversation:

Teacher: Terima kasih (thank you)

Students: sama sama (you're welcome) Teacher: wassalamualaikum warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh

Students: wa alaikumussalam wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh

(The students responded positively and enthusiastically to the teacher because they were happy that the class was over)

In summary, five adjacency pairs appeared in this research. The most common types that appeared in this research were questions and answers, which appeared 51 times. It can be concluded that teachers are more active in the classroom while students tend to be more passive. Students cannot initiate the conversation first, and teachers, as normal people, should start the conversation so that the learning activities can be proceed. Other adjacency pairs that were found in this research were greetings-greetings (2 pairs), request-acceptance (3 pairs), assessment-agreement (3 pairs), question-answer (51 pairs), and leave-taking (1). The total adjacency pairs performed in this classroom conversation are 60 adjacency pairs. Those pairs can be used by the teacher for various purposes depending on the context. Similar with the explanation by Williams (2023) that the roles of these adjacency pairs are numerous, they can enable discussion coherence, aid in the establishment of social relationships, and strengthen participant clarity. For example, in this research, the greetings and greetings pairs are not only to greet the students, but also to give the signal that the lesson will begin soon. After the teacher greets the students, they directly paying attention to the teacher and ready to listen to the lesson. The conclusion drawn that the teacher's usage of adjacency pairs is crucial in facilitating the learning process for students with intellectual disabilities. Similar with Indarti (2018) that found the role of a teacher is needed to engage students in teaching learning process and teacher produce adjacency pairs to interact actively with students. These adjacency pairs assist the teacher in creating a supportive environment in which students can participate more actively and improve their communication abilities during the English teaching and learning.

CONCLUSION(S)

Concerning the first objective of the study, which is to identify the most types of adjacency pairs that occurred in the teaching and learning process in intellectual disability classroom, there were five types of adjacency pairs produced by the teacher and the most used pairs is question and answer adjacency pairs. The other pairs are greetings-greetings, request-acceptance, assessment-agreement, and leave-taking. Meanwhile, the students' responses were mostly with preferred responses or expected answer.

Question-answer occurred 51 times in this research. This pair has a crucial role in maintaining the intellectual disability students to be active in learning activity. The teacher almost initiated the conversation first and the students barely asked questions to the teacher. It means that the students with intellectual disability have problems in conducting the conversation, they cannot open the conversation, or ask questions to the other person. It happened because people with intellectual disability have poor communication skills, limited ability to communicate with others, and low self-initiated social interactions compared to typical students. However, students with intellectual disability can answer the question from the teacher correctly.

The second research objective is about the adjacency pairs used by the teacher in intellectual disability classroom. In conclusion, the analysis of classroom interactions revealed several types of adjacency pairs used by the teacher to facilitate communication and manage the flow of the lesson. Greetings-greetings pairs were effectively utilized to make a welcoming and calm environment as well as to signal the beginning of the lesson. The teacher mostly used Question-answer pairs during classes, which are a common way to engage students to be active in the classroom and verify their understanding

while also checking their readiness. Request-acceptance pairs were used to instruct students to complete assignments and to mark transitions between classroom activities. Assessment-agreement pairs are used to know the reason behind the statements made by the students. Leave-taking pairs were used to provide a signal that the class had ended. Overall, these adjacency pairs helped the teacher to maintain classroom interactions, ensure seamless transitions, and increase student involvement in the classroom.

.

REFERENCES

- Al-Khaza'leh, B. A. (2022). A case study of adjacency pairs in conversation of a group of arab students in informal setting. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 3(4), 84-95. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v3i3>
- Aropi, P., Sahuddin., Lestari, Y. B. (2022). An analysis of adjacency pairs in speaking class at CEC kampoeng pare Mataram 2022. *Journal of English Education Forum*, 2(1), 12-21. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.29303/j.v2i1.271>
- Benghorbal, S. (2017). The Role of Conversation Analysis in Enhancing Classroom Interaction in an EFL situation: The case of the third-year students at Biskra University [Master dissertation, University Mohamed Kheider of Biskra]. <http://archives.univ-biskra.dz/handle/123456789/8663>
- Boat, T. F., & Wu, J. T. (2015). *Mental disorders and disabilities among low-income children*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Chezan, L.C., Drasgow, E., & Grybos, E.M. (2020). Conversation Skills and Self-Initiated Interactions in Young Adults with Autism and Intellectual Disability. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*. doi:chezan<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2020.101554>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed.). New York: Routledge. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029053>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.). California: Sage Publication.
- Fenyi, D. A., & Nyarkoh, I. O. (2022). Turn-taking as a Pedagogical Strategy in Classroom Interaction: A Conversation Analysis of Adjacency Pairs. *Linguistic Initiative*, 2(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.53696/27753719.2225>
- Hoey, E. M. & Kendrick, K. H. (2018). *Conversation Analysis. Research Methods in Psycholinguistics and the Neurobiology of Language: A Practical Guide*. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=LXEzDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA151&ots=NSBCHiewya&dq=Hoey%2C%20E.%2C%20%26%20Kendrick%2C%20K.%20Conversation%20Analysis&lr&hl=id&pg=PA153#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Indarti, G. A. P. (2018). Adjacency Pairs Analysis on Teaching-Learning Process. 2nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceeding, 2. 204-210. <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLiC/article/view/3537>
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage Publication.
- Kurniawan, J. A. (2018). *Perancangan Sekolah Luar Biasa C-C1 Bagi Anak Tunagrahita Di Kabupaten Kulon Progo Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*. Thesis, Uajy. Ta153462.Pdf
- Li, R. (2021). The Role of Teacher-Student Interpersonal Relations in Flipped Learning on Student Engagement. *Front. Psychol.* 12(741810). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.741810
- Li, S. (2016). Classroom Conversation. In M. V. Manen, *Writing in the dark: phenomenological studies in interpretive inquiry*. Routledge.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

- Loeb, S., Dynarski, S., McFarland, D., Morris, P., Reardon, S., & Reber, S. (2017). *Descriptive analysis in education: A guide for researchers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Centre for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Mezmir, E. A. (2020). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Overview of Data Reduction, Data Display and Interpretation. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(21), 15-27. doi: 10.7176/RHSS/10-21-02
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Source Book* (3rd Ed.). United States of America: Sage Publication.
- Nafi, N. N., Rinanda, D., & Sulatri. (2019). The Adjacency Pairs Analysis of Teacher Students Talks in Hearing Impairment Classroom. *Register Journal*, 12(1). 81-99. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v12i1.81-99>
- Ogletree, B. P., Bartholomew, P., Wagaman, J. C., Genz, S., & Reisinger, K. (2012). Emergent Potential Communicative Behaviours in Adults with the Most Severe Intellectual Disabilities. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 34(1). 56-58. doi: 10.1177/1525740112456201
- Paltridge, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Rahmah, L. S., Syihabuddin, Sudana, D., & Gunawan, W. (2022). The adjacency pair responses of conversation analysis mentally retarded person. *Italienisch*, 12(1), 784-796. <http://www.italienisch.nl/index.php/VerlagSauerlander/article/view/251>
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289>
- Shree, A., & Shukla, P. C. (2016). Intellectual Disability: definition, classification, causes and characteristic. *Learning Community*, 7(1) 9-20. doi: 10.5958/2231458X.2016.00002.6
- Siahhaan, J. (2018). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in The Conversation between David Frost and Paul Mc.Cartney. *UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and Call (UCIEL)*. 110-127.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wiles, R., Heath, S., Crow, G., & Charles, V. (2005). *Informed Consent in Social Research: A Literature Review*. NCRM Methods Paper Series Southampton, National Centre for Research Methods. Microsoft Word - NCRM-SER1-05-001-Hub.doc
- Williams, B. (2023). Adjacency Pairs in Discourse Analysis Explained. Retrieved from <https://insight7.io/adjacency-pairs-in-discourse-analysis-explained/>
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversational Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teacher*. Routledge Talyor and Francis Group.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.