

## Types of messages used by mothers to communicate the children: conversation analysis

Oktifani Winarti

*Department of Communication, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur*

Rungkut Madya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: [oktifani.winarti.ilkom@upnjatim.ac.id](mailto:oktifani.winarti.ilkom@upnjatim.ac.id), Phone: +62 31 870 6369

**How to Cite This Article:** Winarti, O. (2023). Types of messages used by mothers to communicate the children: conversation analysis. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 7(1). doi: 10.25139/jsk.v7i1.6154

Received: 13-09-2022, Revision: 28-10-2022, Acceptance: 12-11-2022, Published online: 31-03-2023

**Abstract** Using Conversation Analysis, this paper explores the interaction between a mother and their children while giving morality messages. Conversation Analysis breaks down every interaction between a mother and their children to understand the success of interaction for a mother in delivering moral lessons to her children. By using a natural-setting audio recording and exporting the conversation through excerpts of conversations, this paper reveals three interesting findings from their interaction and turn-taking through varieties of turn-design sequences. The findings of this research show there are three ways of interaction used by mothers: 1) future forecasting, 2) authority-evoking, and 3) self-disclosing.

**Keywords:** conversation analysis, family interaction, morality

### INTRODUCTION

In the past couple of years, social sciences have focused on making sense of morality in various social contexts (Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2007; Kusaka & Marie Karaos, 2017; Listiorini et al., 2019; Tappan, 2006; Waldron et al., 2014) In general, they describe morality as a set of rules that are acknowledged and negotiated concerning what is appropriate and inappropriate. However, studies which try to make sense of morality always examine the 'unseen' morality through everyday interaction in which there is no clear intention that a message about morality is given within the communication, e.g. (Listiorini et al., 2019). It aligns with Bergmann's (Bergmann, 1998) argument that the clarity of moral understanding is hidden in everyday interactions.

Nonetheless, research by Waldron et al. (Waldron et al., 2014) has examined how parents directly communicate right and wrong to their children, including the messages of morality. They use the quantitative methodology to analyse the recall of the memories from the past from both parents and children regarding the way the moral messages were given. The research concluded that parents' messages have a significant role as children learn to understand the morality

behind cultures, religion and their surroundings (Winarti, 2018). They highlight that some of their messages stimulate persuasiveness and that the result can have practical implications for both parents and educators. In explaining the analysis, they also put categories depending on the type of messages delivered, such as coercion, emphasising emotion, future projection, identity shaping and many more (Susilo, 2022). Anyhow, none of the data was collected based on everyday interaction based on audio or video recording as it purely depended on the children's and parents' memories of how they remember addressing the issues (Lehtonen, 2007; Parreñas, 2002; Redmond, 2010; Schänzel, 2012).

Thus, this paper is trying to prove if the strategies explained by Waldron are relevant, as well as to see if moral understanding given when parents are correcting children's misbehaving is also part of parents protecting the identity of the children (Chang & Po Chien, 2015; Cote et al., 2021; North & Kotzé, 2001; Winarti, 2018). In sum, this paper examines how a mother gives moral learning to their children aged 6 and 8 by using the Conversation Analysis method to evaluate if Waldron's research is relevant to the daily interaction between parents and children in giving morality lessons (Garfinkel, 2016; James & Drakich, 1993).

## **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology for this research is Conversation Analysis (CA), laid by the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Mortensen & Wagner, 2013). Garfinkel (Garfinkel, 1967) claims that CA helps practices in making sense of how people create and recreate their social world, which includes how they produce and recognise the way of doing interaction that is culturally accepted by others. Harvey Sacks adds that people show the actions of everyday life from the way they draw their turn-taking through varieties of turn-design, sequences and the following actions taken from the constructed turns (Antaki, 2011).

Thus, the responsibility of using CA for a social scientist is to find evidence for many types of turn-design, interaction order, and action taken by looking at the conversation construction (Susilo, 2017). With the evolution of phenomenology and ethnomethodology approaches, CA provides a comprehensive, logical, integrated category of normative sequences of using languages in regular interaction. Subsequently, those lead to new revelations about people's capabilities (Antaki, 2011). This research uses Jeffersonian transcription to present the data. However, CA has often been misdefined with acts of compliance, or grammatical structures without trying to explain people's motivation for the languages they choose (Hymes, 2005; Juanggo, 2017; Latukolan et al., 2021; Orbe, 2005; Winarti, 2018). Thus, Wei argues that some researchers use CA by applying transcription conventions and detailed conversation transcribes but not drawing CA as it is supposed to. To ensure this research contributes to the right track of CA approach,

during the process, each turn talk is examined with the following points: a) why do things happen in that way and why now? b) How do participants understand the situation? and c) What consequences are drawn in the next turn? Particularly in the implementation of CA for Cross-cultural Communication (CCC), CA works through cultural categories and cultural differences that can be described and measured, which emphasises the notion of nationality, ethnicity or culture as the reason for communicative behaviour through a collected systematic order on how things normally done (Brandt & Mortensen, 2016). Brandt and Mortensen add that there are things to consider in how to analyse CCC research by putting these into account: (a) not using culture as an ultimate reason for miscommunication, (b) not including 'analytic stereotyping' based on only cultural differences, (c) point a and b can help researcher at looking on how culture is relevant to participants' micro-interaction.

As such, this research can achieve the goal of CA for CCC, which is to uncover how interaction is treated as intercultural by those considered. Particularly for this paper, the aim is to analyse how a mother has shared an understanding of what is right and wrong with the children by looking at the intercultural context as she is married to a man of different nationality, talking to the children without using her mother language, and living in England as an expatriate.

Due to the participant's family request, the researcher is only allowed to do audio recording, but profile details are allowed to notify (see appendix for the consent form). The research aims to have several audio recordings of the family interaction in their house daily. Researchers are allowed to use any recordings given by the family after being sorted out privately by the family.

The limitation of this paper is that there is only one mixed marriage, the family being audio-recorded. Although one recording comprises a couple of sequences that show the mother's strategy in delivering morality understanding, which is efficiently describing a spontaneous interaction, the researcher could not have the video recording due to the family's request. Thus, it limits the analysis of non-verbal communication. However, the quality of the recording is clear; hence, it does not give the researcher a difficult time understanding the situation and putting it into an excerpt.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Design of Experiment**

After focusing on the morality issue within the interaction between adults and children, this paper has analysed several points. Some of the points are aligned with Waldron et al. (Waldron et al., 2014) findings which are concluded in table 1: A) "Future-forecasting" in a possible situation that could happen to the children outside the house if they are carrying the misbehaviour they have done. B) "Authority-evoking" by playing the mother's card and mentioning what is wrong and right by emphasising

the authority held by the mother to decide something. C) "Self-disclosing" the conversation to what the mother feels and putting the situation in her shoe kind of perspective.

In addition, there are new findings from the excerpt filling the gap in Waldron's paper about minority families giving morality talk to their children. The interaction reveals how the mother categorises herself and the children differently from society. Although the children are biracial, as the mother is from Indonesia and the father is from England, both children were born and raised in England, and the mother has lived there for almost ten years. The first sequence of the recording indicates the type of message that draws on how parents tend to deliver a serious talk. The message express the notion of "I want you to listen to me", although the recording excerpt does not show the beginning of the talk but directly explains why the discussion over the children misbehaving is evaluated.

The excerpts presented are one continuous conversation between MOM, SAR and DAN, which I split into several excerpts for easier analysis. The complete excerpt can be seen in the appendix. In this situation, SAR and DAN are siblings fighting against what is cool and not cool. Thus, MOM is trying to conciliate the fight and evaluate the situation.

### **Conversation Excerpt 1**

1 MOM : You know mom telling you this because (1.4) when you  
2 fighting (.) you say things that you didn't mean to↓ (1.4)  
3 okay↑  
4 SAR : °okay°  
5 MOM : and you (.) you shouting to each other you are angry to one  
6 another (.) you swearing to one another  
7 >I can understand↑ , you know, sometimes problems we cannot  
8 avoid it, and sometimes we are fighting  
9 but to use your hand↑ to raise your hand↑ to pinching (.)  
10 or smacking it is not a nice thing↑ you know↑<

The researcher thinks it is worth mentioning that the conversation draws similar results with one of Sterponi's excerpts at some point. The point where the parent would like to make sure that the conversation is serious, but even though it is discussing children's faults, it does not mean all the blame goes to the children. Starting from line one, MOM says, "mom telling you this because", and follows 1.4 pauses as a foreshadow that the following issues she is about to say are important and the following statement expresses the thought of fighting is not right, but mom tried to express that she understands that when people fight they say words they did not mean. The following excerpts show many follow-up questions, such as "okay?", "do you understand?" or "you know" is the mom's effort to ensure her children's participation in the conversation.

After SAR replies "okay" without any pause, MOM continues with details of wrong behaviour such as shouting, swearing and being angry between siblings, which is explained in lines 5, 6, 9 and 10. However, again in lines 7 and 8, MOM explains that she understands that fighting is understandable and that it happens under particular circumstances. Before then, she points out her children's mistakes in lines 9 and 10 and directly categorises those misbehaving as not a nice thing. Hereafter is the analysis of each point that aligns with Waldron's findings, yet no close study of the daily interaction is examined in the research. The last point of Perspective-taking as a minority family is the analysis of my finding that Waldron mentions. However, due to the limitation of the data, no valid conclusion was drawn to explain the situation of immigrant families in terms of morality conversation.

### **Future-forecasting**

Future forecasting is used to categorise the type of message to direct children's behaviour to the possibilities in the future (Waldron et al., 2014). The following excerpt is the follow-through from the previous conversation, drawing the step-by-step how mother tells the future prediction that can happen if the children insist with their conduct and the consequences that evolve along with it.

### **Conversation Excerpt 2**

10 MOM : You know if you are- if you go to one place, let us go  
11       you go to a restaurant, or you go to the café, and you go  
12       meet someone↓ , and you start fighting, and you start pinching  
13       them and smacking them (.) Do you know what happens↑  
14 Dan : °hm↑°  
15 MOM : The person will call the police  
16       and you will get into trouble  
17       You'd probably get into the prison  
18       Because violent is not allowed  
19       Do you understand↑  
20 SAR : Ehem↓  
21 MOM : This is for you as well Daniel  
22       You know, when you fighting, especially with someone you  
23       don't know (1.0), and then the person is hurt  
24       You know you don't know like h- what is the scale of the  
25       argument you go when it is escalating and someone ha:rmed↑  
26       Probably in the serious injury, they could end up in the  
27       hospital↑ (1.6) It is not a nice thing↑

In lines 10 to 13, Mom makes a parable about her children fighting in a public place and altercating with someone just like SAR and DAN fight. At the end of line 13, MOM asks, "do you know what happen" as an act of engaging her children in the conversation, which I find it important in situations like this to make sure the children are still

following what the mother is saying. As DAN responds to the question of his mother as a sign of listening, even though DAN is not answering the question of her mother, MOM is directly telling the consequences in lines 15 to 17 which she points out the legal-law consequences that can happen in England and emphasising what is not allowed to do, which is violent. Thus, in line 19, MOM asks, "do you understand?" which is responded to only by SAR. Since DAN is not responding, which reflect as a sign of disengaging (Sacks et al., 1974) in the excerpt line 21 to 27 shows that MOM is making sure that the conversation is not only blaming her daughter, which is already shown since the beginning of the interaction that this conversation is not trying to concern the children but for them to understand what goes wrong.

### **Authority-evoking**

Authority-evoking is a message highlighting the authority source and adults' credibility (Waldron et al., 2014). The pattern in the following excerpt is how mother use the mother's card by telling what the children can and cannot do and categorising each of the gestures done by the children. In this episode, I would say that this excerpt displays how parents approve and unapproved certain behaviour and construct the expected ones. Aligning it to the table on page 9, Waldron separates the type of "identity-shaping" and "authority-invoking" into different categories. Thus, I would argue that "authority-invoking" contributes the most to children's identity shaping. As "identity-shaping", the approving and rejecting children's misbehaviour does not have to be coming based on a set of rules or values from religions, cultures, ethnicity or gender as described by Waldron.

### **Conversation Excerpt 3**

28 MOM : So I want you both↓  
29 Even though you are fighting get o:ver it and try not to use  
30 your hand pinching and smacking  
31 Sarah you shouldn't do that to your brother from now on (.)  
32 Do you understand↑  
33 SAR : ((mumbling in a sobbing voice)) Daniel started it  
34 MOM : Hum↑  
35 SAR : ((mumbling in a sobbing voice))  
36 MOM : What did Daniel do Did you start it Daniel↑  
37 DAN : it's just firstly i- i- um (.) I hear Sarah saying  
38 something to me like about cool stuff with this thing  
39 and I'm like (.) that's not cool at all and she says it is  
40 and we stop then Sar- then I say it's not cool again  
41 and s- Sarah says it is then I say it's [not that's all  
42 MOM : [okay this is one  
43 thing also I want to tell you guys(.)it's no:t acceptable  
44 you know if you ha- you having different opinion you  
45 thinking oh this phone is cool oh that phone is not co↓ol.

46 not it's cool↑ no it's not↑ you know it's- it's like  
47 meaningless argument there's no need of that (.) do you  
48 guys understand  
49 DAN : °yeah°  
50 MOM : You know don't try to provoke your sister  
51 Sarah as well not provoking one another  
(1.9)  
52 DAN : °okay°  
(0.3)  
53 MOM : >do you feel bad in this case↑ do you feel right in this  
54 case↑ is it acceptable to do this↑<  
55 DAN : °No°  
(0.2)  
56 MOM : What do you think  
57 is it acceptable to do this↓ (1.0) hm↑  
58 (1.0)  
59 Sarah Mom talking to you  
60 (2.0)  
61 I cannot take sides because both of you wrong↑  
62 (1.2)  
63 But to smacking↑ (.) and pinching↑ (.) it's to:tally  
64 unacceptable (0.2) in my house there is no such things  
65 like that (.) understand↑  
66 DAN : yes  
67 (1.0)  
68 MOM : Sarah understand  
69 Sarah (2.0) do you understand (2.9) or you still not happy  
70 This is already the second time and this is >really really  
71 really< not acceptable↓  
72 (6.4)  
73 Daniel not try- not- don't ever try to provoke your sister  
74 if it's not important you don't hurt people's feeling ↑

In the delivery of "authority-evoking" messages, the sentences such as "I want you both", "You should not do that", "try not to do that", or "it is not acceptable" are used to direct children's conduct. In line 28, MOM emphasises her talk of "I want you both", followed by a statement that it is not allowed to use physical touch such as pinching and smacking when fighting. In lines 31 to 33, SAR denies that she is wrong by saying that DAN started it first, and when MOM asks what SAR just said, she tries to explain while sobbing. Blame utterances usually reflect an unhappy gesture towards something, followed by recipient ignorance (Bergmann, 1998) and such gesture reflected in the next lines of conversation such as lines 59 and 69, where SAR decides to pull herself out from the conversation by not ignoring her mother's questions. In lines 68 to 74, Sarah puts herself out of the conversation by displaying

a 6.4 pause as her response to her mother's question. After the long pause, in line 73, repair happens.

It is worth highlighting as well that in line 36, MOM asks what did DAN do to start the fight. The response from DAN is not a denial, but he justifies the unfortunate situation. The justification does not then repair the situation because MOM cuts off DAN's talk and comes up with another point of mistake. Niemi et al., (2020) argues that implicit morality talk is a sequence of negotiating talks. However, negotiation does not seem to happen in an explicit morality talk.

### **Self-disclosing**

Self-disclosing type of message is used to introduce feelings and perspectives to another. It also concludes parents' moral stories from the past and how they digest moral challenges based on unpleasant situations (Waldron et al., 2014). Self-disclosing aims to raise children's empathy by bringing up a similar situation that the parent already faced in the past.

The following excerpt is a short episode of the mother's self-disclosing. What is interesting is that in lines 81 to 86, MOM tells a story about how she sees the situation about not hurting others, but in line 87, she switches the subject from "I" to "We" as a gesture of togetherness and representing a mutual agreement. Although SAR still does not respond to what her mother is saying, in lines 91 and 95, MOM decides to make her conclusion for SAR while asking if SAR is still upset about what happened.

### **Conversation Excerpt 4**

81 MOM : if it's not important you don't hurt people's feeling ↑  
82 Mom↑- mom try to avoid anything that hurt people (.)  
83 so if we say things and we think like oh you know that's  
84 gonna hurt them (.) I'm not gonna say it↓  
85 (1.2)  
86 Because it's not a nice thing↓  
87 We don't want to hurt people's feeling↓  
88 DAN : `yeah↓°  
89 MOM : Do you understand Daniel  
90 DAN : `yeah↑°  
91 MOM : Sarah as well ya↑  
92 (1.4)  
93 not hurting ya↑  
94 (.)  
95 Not hurting other people's feeling and <not smacking and  
96 pinching darling↓> okay↑ (0.2) are you still feeling upset

Another interesting point is the changing position alongside SAR acts of silence. Niemi et al., (2020) claim that participants' responses, both the answer and act of silence, will transform participants' position



within the interaction. I would then say SAR caused a trouble source the first time she decided not to be engaged in the conversation by not replying to her mother anymore. Thus, successful moral talk cannot be measured due to silence. It is different compare to DAN which is still responding and showing that he is listening and trying to understand the situation.

The following excerpt shows another self-disclosing which indicates cooling down the situation as in line 102. MOM says, " I do not want to hurt your feeling". In this case, MOM does not talk about two people fighting but more about the fact that MOM has no intention to hurt people's feelings and to pick up a fight, especially with her children, even though the children make a mistake by making a mess with the laptop.

### **Conversation Excerpt 5**

- 1 MOM: okay come on then hugging each other then
- 2       Look at mom's phone seems like it's going to break now
- 3       Look at the laptop (.) it's all o::ver now (.) this can be
- 4       broken↓ but am I getting angry to you sitting on it↑
- 5       No↓
- 6       Why↑ (.) Because I don't want to hurt your feeling↑
- 7       So Daniel and Sarah hugging each other please (.) come here
- 8       Daniel↓ (1.6)

### **Perspective-Taking as a minority family**

Waldron slightly discusses this type of message in his study. It is mostly a message about how in immigrant families, parents want their children to make the family proud even though they are not in their home country. However, a study of conversation analysis in an immigrant family is examined by Bolden (Bolden, 2014). In her study, she claims that immigrant family does make categorisation depending on their nationality, language, ethnicity or age to the interactional moments. However, she asserts that differences in the cultural background will not bring any communication problems. Thus, I believe the position where MOM differentiates her family from others in the country does not significantly affect the conversation other than trying to cool down the situation.

Although in line 110, MOM poses a question that seems to construct "intercultural moments" by asking what will happen if they fight all the time while only the three are in a foreign country (Bolden, 2014). The next turn is DAN responding to his mother's request to hug each other, not to the question posed in line 110. I would argue that it has any effect because this question is usually used to check recipients' knowledge of a concept (Bolden, 2014). However, unorderly turn-taking can also indicate a problem in a conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). Due to the limitation of the conversation as the source of evidence, this subchapter can then be examined and considered to be taken into

further future research in the context of family communication.

### **Conversation Excerpt 6**

103 So Daniel and Sarah hugging each other please (.) come here

104 Daniel↓

105 (1.6)

106 you know (0.9) in- in this country is only the

107 Three of \$us\$ (.) We need to look after one another

108 If we fight all of the time (0.9) what's happening↓

109 (1.0)

110 Can you tell me what's happening if we fighting all of the

111 time

112 DAN: she's gonna take it as a no

113 MOM: yeah↑ it's going to get us nowhere↓

114 Sarah understand nak↑

The study shows that morality talk between parents and children is true as a way to shape children's identities. All types of messages delivered aim to develop children's identity through the evaluation of children's misbehaving and so I conclude that "identity-shaping" type of message brought by Waldron et al. (Waldron et al., 2014) should not be categorised as a morality type of message. This research has also shown how children decide to be engaged and disengaged inside a conversation delivered by a mother when discussing their conduct and how the mother takes the strategy to deliver the messages, which I believe both parents and moral educators can use to improve the strategies in giving a moral lesson.

### **CONCLUSION**

According to the results of this research, there are three different modes of engagement that a mother can utilise within the same encounter: 1) predicting the future, 2) invoking one's authority, and 3) revealing one's thoughts and feelings. Nonetheless, the result is limited in the number of participants. The family in this study is a mix-marriage family, and there is a finding on perspective-taking as a minority family in giving morality. However, only a little conversation recorded indicates how a mother categorises their beings in a foreign country as a part of her way of giving a moral understanding to her children. The author believe this can be used as future research direction in cross-cultural communication and focusing on the context of family interaction.

## REFERENCES

- Antaki, C. (2011). *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bergmann, J. R. (1998). Introduction: Morality in discourse. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 31(3-4), 279-294.
- Bolden, G. B. (2014). Negotiating understanding in "intercultural moments" in immigrant family interactions. *Communication Monographs*, 81(2), 208-238.
- Brandt, A., & Mortensen, K. (2016). Conversation Analysis. In: Zhu Hua (Ed.). In *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide*. Wiley.
- Chang, P.-C., & Po Chien, J. C. (2015). The examination of parent-adolescent communication motives, relational maintenance and intimacy in the uses of communication technologies. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 7(10), 171-181. <https://doi.org/10.5897/jmcs2015.0457>
- Cote, A. C., Coles, S. M., & Dal Cin, S. (2021). The interplay of parenting style and family rules about video games on subsequent fighting behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 47(2), 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21931>
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (2016). Studies in ethnomethodology. In *Social Theory Re-Wired: New Connections to Classical and Contemporary Perspectives: Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775357>
- Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2007). Children socialising children: Practices for negotiating the social order among peers. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 279-289.
- Hymes, D. (2005). Models of the interaction of language and social life: toward a descriptive theory. *Intercultural Discourse and Communication: The Essential Readings*, 4-16.
- James, D., & Drakich, J. (1993). Understanding gender differences in amount of talk: A critical review of research. *Gender and Conversational Interaction*.
- Juanggo, W. (2017). The Concept of L2 User and the goals of Second Language Learning. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v1i2.142>
- Kusaka, W., & Marie Karaos, A. (2017). Moral Politics in the Philippines: Inequality, Democracy and the Urban Poor. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.1355/cs39-3j>
- Latukolan, J. J., Marta, R. F., & Engliana, E. (2021). When Words Matter: Language Choices and Brand Building on Two Global Coffee Shop Retail Brands in Indonesia. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 2899-2906. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1974>
- Lehtonen, S. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis and children's fantasy fiction-modelling a new approach. *Past, Present, Future-From Women's Studies to Post-Gender Research*, 14-17.
- Listiorini, D., Asteria, D., & Sarwono, B. (2019). Moral panics on lgbt issues: evidence from indonesian tv programme. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 3(3), 355. <https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v3i3.1882>
- Mortensen, & Wagner. (2013). Conversation Analysis: Overview. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Niemi, L., Hartshorne, J., Gerstenberg, T., Stanley, M., & Young, L. (2020). Moral Values Reveal the Causality Implicit in Verb Meaning. *Cognitive Science*, 44(6). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12838>
- North, E., & Kotzé, T. (2001). Parents and television advertisements as consumer socialisation agents for adolescents: An exploratory study. *Journal of Consumer Sciences*, 29.
- Orbe, M. (2005). Continuing the legacy of theorizing from the margins: Conceptualizations of co-cultural theory. *Women and Language*, 28(2), 65.
- Parreñas, R. (2002). *The care crisis in the Philippines: Children and transnational families in the new global economy*. na.
- Redmond, D. L. (2010). The effect of video games on family communication and interaction. In *Future of Children* (Vol. 18).

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Schänzel, H. (2012). The Inclusion of Fathers, Children and the Whole Family Group in Tourism Research on Families. In *Family Tourism* (pp. 67–80). Channel View Publications.
- Susilo, D. (2017). Etnometodologi Sebagai Pendekatan Baru dalam Kajian Ilmu Komunikasi. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v1i1.66>
- Susilo, D. (2022). *Teori - teori Komunikasi Manusia*. Gramedia.
- Tappan, M. B. (2006). Mediated moralities: Sociocultural approaches to moral development. In *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 351–374).
- Waldron, V. R., Kloeber, D., Goman, C., Piemonte, N., & Danaher, J. (2014). How parents communicate right and wrong: A study of memorable moral messages recalled by emerging adults. *Journal of Family Communication*, 14(4), 374–397.
- Winarti, O. (2018). Language Shift of Krama to Bahasa Indonesia among Javanese Youths and it's Relation to Parents' Social Class. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*. <https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v2i3.186>