



as a unit. Meanwhile turn allocation component is describes how participants organize their interaction by distributing turns to speaker. Taboada, (2006) deal with turn-taking is usually considered to follow a simple set of rules, enacted through a perhaps more complicated system of signals. Kato, (2000) remarks that turn-taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation, and the convention of turn-taking varies between cultures and languages; therefore, learners of a foreign language may find it difficult to take their turns naturally and properly in other tongues. However, the mechanisms by which people take turns speaking in a conversation are spoken and nonverbal, open and subconscious. (Wiemann and Knapp: 1975)

Turn taking can be found easily in our environment especially in a daily conversation. Thorisson, (2002) presents a computational model of natural turn-taking in goal-oriented, face-to-face dialogue. It was also examined from different perspectives for instance turn taking in social talk dialogues (Louis, 2004) turn taking in universal and cultural variation (Enfield, 2009). Turn taking in verbal interaction (Spyros:2001), Turn-taking in cross-sex and cross-cultural communication (Term Paper, 2007), Larue (1993) remarks in many formal situations, such as committee meetings and debates, turn taking mostly occurred in conversation that is taken into consideration became interaction between speakers and hearers.

According to Levinson, et al. (2009) despite 'obvious' nature turn taking (i.e. A speaks, then B speaks, then A speaks again) this is the way in which

distribution is achieved is anything but obvious. Taking of turns obscures the significance of how people act. By subordinating action to word-based patterns, talk comes to be conceptualized independently of timing. Cowley, (1983) the concept of turn taking is central to conversation analysis turn taking organizes the distribution and the flow of speech between the two participants of interaction there by keeping speech continuous. Richard (1989) turn taking has been described as a process in which one participant talk, then stops and give the floor to another participant who starts talking, so the researcher obtain a distribution of talk across two participants.

In the previous study, Tanya et al. (2009) examines turn taking conversation in a universal manner. They test these opposing hypotheses: a universal system hypothesis, by which turn-taking is a universal system with minimal cultural variability, and a cultural variability hypothesis, by which turn-taking is language and culture dependent. They compared data from video recordings of informal natural conversation in 10 languages from 5 continents. The results show that all of the languages tested provide clear evidence for a general avoidance of overlapping talk and a minimization of silence between conversational turns. It is too much when the researcher uses 10 languages from 5 continents, maybe just 5 languages from 3 continents, it can be more specific. If it is compared with my research, it is little different because my research take from movie script with formal language in the very formal situation, and do not load different languages from different cultures.

Louis and Ruitter (2004) analyze about durational aspects of turn-taking in spontaneous face to- face and telephone dialogues. That is two-speaker spontaneous conversations. The dataset used in the study consists of 29 face-to-face dialogues and 32 telephone dialogues, both face-to-face dialogues and telephone dialogues are informal and spontaneous; speakers knew each other and could freely talk about any subject. The results show that the distributions of both pauses and speech-overlaps of telephone and face to-face dialogues have different statistical properties. The differences between spontaneous face to face in dialogue is speaker and hearer can take the turn directly without any obstacle of the signal telephone, and also know whether speaker talk in serious situation or just kidding. Meanwhile when speaker uses spontaneous dialogue in telephone, sometimes the hearer can't hear as well as possible because of any obstacle of signal telephone. A speaker usually speaks many times if the hearer can't hear what the speaker is talking about and the hearer also doesn't know whether the speaker is talking seriously or just kidding.

Louis and Ruitter (2004) continue their research, but in this case, they analyze turn-taking in social talk dialogues within some aspects: temporal, formal and functional aspects. They use a quantitative analysis of the turn-taking mechanism evidenced in 93 telephone dialogues. This analysis above explains that turn taking in social talk within 3 aspects, but in this research just explain temporal phenomena and functional without finding formal aspects. The result shows that speaker adapt their turn taking behavior to the interlocutor's behavior.

Furthermore, the results indicate that male-male dialogs show a higher proportion of overlapping turns than female-female dialogues. Unfortunately, this research can't explain more to distinguish turn taking in social talk dialogues between temporal, formal, and functional aspects. It just explain that speaker adapt their turn taking behavior with a result between average pause durations in the speech produced by the speaker. The data from 93 telephone dialogues is very much, while in a subject just 8 dialogues. The difference is striking. This analysis explains that turn taking in social talk within 3 aspects, but in the research just explains temporal phenomena and functional without formal aspects.

Talking about duration of turn taking in conversation, there is also previous study examine tone of turn taking. Kato (2000) examines how tone signals turn-taking, with respect to the function of tone choice because tone reflects the context of interaction and the role-relationship between participants. It also uses movie as material and the advantages if students as reader is they can learn that utterances with a falling tone function as interrogative only when the form is an interrogative one starting with whom and how. Listening to an utterance with focus on its grammatical and into national forms does not give a proper cue for smooth turn-taking. However, in natural language, form and function do not always correspond. It is strongly suggested that a discourse-based approach should be taken. The aim of this research is to examine how tone signals turn taking with respects to the function of tone choice. If compared with my research, it is use movie as a material, but in this research focuses on tone

signals of turn taking, while my research just focuses on the model of turn taking without analysis tone of turn taking.

Cowley (1998) said that by taking turn-taking to be an explanatory principle, many discourse analysts fall into the error of mistaking a metaphor for an empirical finding. From his perspective, turn-taking is no more than a convenient label for different ways of acting, like temporal, prosodic, and visible properties of talk which is how speakers alternate can be shown to collate significantly with a range of communication factors. He was thinking in term of turn taking may appear innocuous. That is first because it fits the schooled individual's bias that conversations are essentially trains of word-based forms. Second, as spelled out and implied by research into conversational substance, transcription-based analysis suppresses much of human communication. This analysis challenges the idea that conversation are reducible to sequences of word-based from alternately spoken by different individuals.

Sack, et. al (1977) studied the organization of turn taking conversations, and proposed a model alleged to be both context and context independently. They examine a variety of recorded, natural conversations in their seminal review "the systematic of turn taking in conversation". They conclude that the turn taking seems a basic form of organization for conversation. But as Sack, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1977) also state, the turn taking system in effect in informal conversations may be a central component of the one that governs more formal interactions, such that the formal system would in some sense have an

additional set of secondary-level features not contained in the informal system and that different turn-taking systems may be involved (Sacks et al. 1974).

These previous studies above have examined turn taking in the several focuses, there are focus on conversation in universal manner (Tanya et al.:2009), turn taking in many formal situations (Larue, 1993), turn taking duration in spontaneous face to face and telephone dialogues (Louis et al: 2004), then they continue their research and analyze turn-taking in social talk dialogues within some aspects: temporal, formal and functional aspects. There is also researcher who examine tone signals turn-taking, (Kato, 2000) and so on.

There is new previous study from (Nugroho and Ariyanti, 2014) turn taking used in interview TV program “Indonesia now exclusive Agnes Monica with Dalton Tanonaka” on Metro TV. They focus on the way participants in a conversation take and construct the turn to talk. It is similar to my research that use descriptive design, and some theories from Sacks, et al (1974). The difference is that they also add theory about turn-taking systems from other theories about the cultural background of conversation in using turn taking strategies. The advantage of their analysis is that a lot of phenomena are found out about taking the turn to talk and also new thing that interruption has relation with overlap. My research, however, just shows how the main character in the movie takes turn and whether it includes turn constructional component or turn allocation component.

There is newest research from (Chow, Mitchell, and Miller: 2015) vocal turn-taking in a non-human primate is learned during ontogeny, they recorded the natural vocal interactions of common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*) occurring with both their sibling twins and parents over the first year of life and observed at least two parallels with language development. This research is different from the others; it includes the unique research because the findings suggest that similar learning mechanisms may be implemented in the ontogeny of vocal turn-taking across our order, a finding that has important implications for our understanding of language evolution.

If my research is compared to other research above, although many research focuses on turn taking, but no one of the research develops a model of turn taking. My research is the newest research that examines the model of turn taking, which includes turn constructional component and turn allocation component. But the focus of my research is just to examine whether the turn taking from the main character's conversation in the movie includes turn constructional component or turn allocation component. It doesn't explain detail about duration, cross-talk, tone and so on.

In the present study, the writer takes into account some previous studies that have successfully revealed in turn taking. In the earlier study have examined about turn taking, she observe turn taking in the object of situation (Larue, 1993). The next year there is researcher examine about tone signals turn-taking, (Kato, 2000).









*Communication* is two way process of reaching mutual understanding, in which participants not only exchange (encode-decode) information, news, ideas and feelings but also create and share meaning.

*The turn constructional component* describes basic units out of which turns are fashioned. These basic units are known as turn construction unit TCU. Unit types include: lexical, clausal, phrasal, and sentential.

*The turn allocation component* describes how participants organize their interaction by distributing turns to speakers.