



The Adjacency Pair Patterns in Spoken Interaction of Roundtable Discussion With Susi Pudjiastuti

Jati Widya Iswara^{1✉}, Dwi Rukmini², Widhiyanto²

¹ SD N Ngaliyan 03, Semarang, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Recived 03 February 2019

Accepted 20 June 2019

Published 15

September 2019

Keywords:

CA, Adjacency Pair Patterns, Communicative Functions, Power and Status Relation, Roundtable Discussion

Abstract

Conversation Analysis (CA) is an issue of Pragmatics. CA is a way to analyze a conversation by its elements such as turn-taking, and adjacency pair produced by the speakers. In this present study, the researcher conduct research in the field of CA, but more specific the researcher investigates in the adjacency pair patterns and communicative functions in spoken interaction of roundtable discussion with Susi Pudjiastuti. Since people know that Minister Susi has a lot of controversy on her duty as an Indonesia Minister of Maritime affairs and Fisheries, there are such unique facts that can be seen by this present study. The aims of this research are to investigate how do the adjacency pair patterns construct in the spoken interaction of roundtable discussion with Susi Pudjiastuti, how the communicative functions realized in the roundtable discussion, and how do the power and status relation reflect to the participants of roundtable discussion. Qualitative method used in this present study. The researcher found eleven patterns of adjacency pair that construct in the roundtable discussion. Then, eleven communicative functions were realized in the roundtable discussion. At last, the researcher found many interruption produced by Minister Susi, and it shown that power and status relation reflect to the way she is more dominated in the roundtable discussion. This research has beneficial value for teacher, lecturer, and student in order to enrich their knowledge especially in adjacency pair patterns.

© 2019 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉Correspondence Address:

JL. Prof. Hamka, Tambakaji, Kec. Ngaliyan, Kota Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50185

e-mail : jati.iswara@yahoo.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Learning and mastering foreign language, especially English as foreign language, the learners have to learn and understand four skills namely writing, Reading, Speaking, and Listening. Then, Language has many branches based on its point of views. The one of language branches whose point of view is language use is pragmatics. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which learns about the use of language with the use of its context. The meaning of the language is understandable if the context is known. Limitations of pragmatics are the rules of the use of language form and meaning dealing with the speaker intention, the context and the circumstances.

According to Crystal (1987: 120) pragmatics studies are the factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effect of our choice on others. Based on the theory above, interaction is needed in human life to create a good relationship, business, and also social roles.

Moreover, Tauchid and Rukmini (2016) stated that Pragmatics intend to identify the intention with which utterances are pronounced and how they may help clarify the meanings behind some grammatical structures that do not render their transparent pragmatics force on the basis of their construction. In line to the statement above, in every conversation in written or spoken form, there is an implicit meaning of its utterance that should be analyzed in order to know how it works and how many elements involve in conversation itself.

Then, Schiffirin (1994:231) stated "Conversational analysis is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concerns with the problem of social order, and how language both creates and is created by social context." In addition from Fitriana and Sofwan (2017), the use of language shows people's relationship and attitude towards others. However, organizing words that will be uttered in turn-taking of conversation will contribute a good notion in order to keep the conversation still alive.

Meanwhile, Conversation analysis has a part namely adjacency pairs and also with its patterns as an equipment in analyzing conversation. Then, in analyzing conversation, there is a way in analyzing discourse about interaction between parties namely conversation analysis (CA). CA is one of issues in Pragmatics focused on interaction between parties. Conversation analysis emphasize in the way parties doing turn-taking and adjacent in creating context of communication.

Another theory from Fitriana and Sofwan (2017) state that the use of language shows people's relationship and attitude towards others. However, organizing words that will be uttered in turn-taking of conversation will contribute a good notion in order to keep the conversation still alive.

Conversation analysis has a part namely adjacency pairs and also with its patterns as an equipment in analyzing conversation. According to Paltridge (2006: 115) utterances produced by two successive speakers in a way that the second utterances is identified as related to the first one as an expected follow-up to that utterance.

Here is the example of adjacency pair in the conversation by Yule:

- (1) Anna : Hello. (Greeting 1)
- (2) Bill : Hi. (Response for greeting 1)
- (3) Anna : How are you? (Question 2)
- (4) Bill : Fine. (Answer 2 for question 2)
- (5) Anna : See ya! (Leave taking 3)
- (6) Bill : Bye. (Response for leave taking 3)

Based on the example above, the adjacency pair is the result of situation in communication based on purposes, and participant of the conversation itself. Moreover, the effect of adjacency patterns will influence the speech function and also communicative functions based on the negotiation produced by the speakers. Meanwhile, the effect of status and power relation also have an effect in delivering something, asking, and answering between speakers in the conversation circumstances. For

instance, there are four speakers in the discussion, there is one speaker who has higher social status as a minister, and then the rest speakers are only civil servants. Here, the governor who attends in the discussion has more power in interrupting, frequent in asking, and has liberties in answering question or response for a statement.

In this research, the researcher has found Minister Susi Pudjiastuti as a subject of the research. In short, people know that Minister Susi is pointed by Mr. Presiden Joko Widodo to be a Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia. Then, as a minister, she has a lot of unique things based on her duty, her attitude, and the way she negotiates with people or stakeholders.

In another hand, Minister Susi as a policy maker for Illegal Unreported Unregulated (IUU) fishing boats has an extreme things in shutting down them. She blows up the illegal boats which tried to enter the coastline of Indonesia water and catch fish in illegal ways. Mr. President Joko Widodo gives a good signal for Minister Susi to keep doing right, straight, and strict for illegal fishing boats from all countries around the world. Minister Susi has to do that because of she wants to save the aqua culture of Indonesia water

Moreover, there are a lot of people showing their proud and so impressed because of Minister Susi has a unique background of education. She is only graduated from Junior High School as a formal school, and then continue her Senior High School by informal institution. Based on her background of education, Minister Susi can speak English as well and she often attends on International Conference as a guest speaker, and also interact with foreign stakeholder around the world.

Meanwhile, the researcher try to conduct a research based on the unique of characteristics from Minister Susi in the way of turn-taking, delivering, and answering in the discussion. The researcher also rely on the theory and result of previous study in order to enrich the result.

Here is previous studies about CA, Olutayo (2013), this study attempts to fill this

gap by examining natural conversations in television discourse. The findings revealed seven main determinants of patterns and features of turn-taking namely: discourse topic, duration of the programme, composition of the guests/participants, culture, social status, gender and the personality of the hosts. These revealed the nature of the show and participation, floor occupation, shared understanding, turn quantification and emotiveness.

Ali (2018), this research aims at investigating the way in which turn taking behaviour and interaction pattern help the participants to interpret each other's meanings, and comparing between *The Doctors* and *Shabab Wbanat* in interaction strategies which are examined qualitatively and quantitatively. The findings showed that both shows are sharing several characteristics of ordinary conversation in spite of being conducted in institutional setting. *The Doctors* TV show is different from *Shabab wbanat* in several spontaneous interferences, symmetrical relations, and mode of interaction. Iraqi TV show is closer to institutional talk than the American TV show. Two of examples above indicate that turn-taking as interaction in conversation as prominent thing in conversation analysis (CA).

Another previous studies related to adjacency pair analysis come from Hasan (2015) aims to analyse adjacency pair used by main characters in *Knight and day* movie. Adjacency pairs are the pair of interchanged utterances between two successive speakers. This study focused on 4 aspects of conversation those are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, and pre-sequence and insertion sequence.

Saputra (2016), this study aims to reveal kinds of adjacency pairs as used in mathematic students' conversation using English. Since the data were sentences and words, qualitative method was applied in this study. The result of study, there were found a lot of question and answer during the conversation between non-native speakers, and the another result, there were less of question-answer between non-native

speaker to native speaker in the video of conversation.

Khumaidillah (2016) this study attempts to describe turn taking strategies and adjacency pairs used by the speakers. The data are from one segment of The Oprah Winfrey Show's transcription with Justin Bieber. Those are analysed by Stenstorm's turn taking theories and adjacency pair theories. From the analysis, it was found that both speakers use various turn taking strategies and adjacency pairs. These findings are hoped to be an example for non-native English speaker in doing English conversation and advance people's comprehension of how to organize good conversation structure.

The last previous studies about power and status relation come from Achsan and Sofwan (2016) investigated the tenor of the interaction in the conversation texts found grade X English textbooks as well as the appropriacy of their realization in the given contexts. This study also explains the similarities and differences between conversation texts found in both English textbooks in realizing tenor. This study was a qualitative research employing a descriptive comparative method. The comparative method. The result of lexicogrammatical analysis of conversation texts found in two English textbooks showed the texts of two textbooks were dominated by declarative.

Hung & Deng (2019) investigated in five dynamic language-power relationship in communication have emerged from critical language studies, conversation analysis, the social psychology of language and communication, and also sociolinguistics. Since the data consist of words, qualitative descriptive were applied to interpret the findings. The finding revealed power exist at both of micro and macro levels.

Well, in this present study, the researcher deals with three research pronlem; 1). How do the adjacency pair patterns constructed in the spoken interaction of roundtable discussion with Susi Pudjiastuti at Stimson Center. 2). How do the communicative functions realized in the roundtable discussion. 3). How do the power

and status relation reflect to the patterns of adjacency pair.

METHOD

This study deals to qualitative research. Then, as cited in Astuti (2009:31), qualitative research focuses on specific situation or people and it emphasis on words rather than numbers (Maxwell, 1996). Based on the statement above, the form of data in this study is spoken and for collecting data, the researcher will interpret through words and also gives explanation on it.

This study assumes that there are many items found in the roundtable discussion with Susi Pudjiastuti at Stimson Center. The researcher found three items such as adjacency pair patterns, communicative functions, and power and status relation in the roundtable discussion between the parties. Since the researcher collected and analyzed data by interpreting to make a conclusion, this study categorized as qualitative research. This study will focus on interpreting English-Indonesian translation of conversation between parties during the discussion.

In this study, the subjects are the host Minister Susi Pudjiastuti as guest speaker, and the participants of roundtable discussion. Then, the conversation between the host and the audience of Stimson Centre, and also Minister Susi Pudjiastuti is the object of the study.

In collecting data, there are four steps such as: 1). Watching the video of the roundtable discussion produced by the parties. 2). Transcribing the conversation on paper. 3). Categorizing the data into instrument sheet. 4). Observing the data into pedagogical view. Then, in analyzing data, the researcher have six steps, they are: 1). Classifying the data into adjacency pair patterns. 2). Classifying the communicative functions of spoken interaction of parties. 3). Interpreting the adjacency pair patterns constructed in the spoken interaction. 4). Interpreting the communicative functions realized in the discussion. 5). Interpreting power and status relation of participants. 6).

Interpreting the findings. 7). Reporting the result of study.

However, in analyzing the data, the researcher applied many theories to analyze the data. The theory of Paltridge (2006) is applied in process analyzing patterns of adjacency pair, then the theory of Jakobson (1960), and Schiffrin (2006) are applied to analyze communicative functions. Then, to analyze power and status relation in the roundtable discussion, the researcher deals with Halliday (1989), Gerrot and Wignel (1994), and Egins (1994).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Adjeceny Pair Patterns Constructed in the Discussion

The first procedure analysed is adjacency pair patterns constructed in the discussion. Schegolff (2007: 3) stated that adjacency pair is a sequential shift produced by the speakers. In line to Wiratno (2018) adjacency pair based on the speaker and the hearer then take turns during the exchange. Here is the example of analyzing adjacency pair patterns namely announcement.

Datum 1

Sally : But I mean,
I think, I read some articles of you
explode 3016 vessels at this point.

Minister Susi : Yes, and we
still have another hundred.

Datum 2

Minister Susi : So, that's not true if
we give different treat. It is not easy to catch
them because they are bigger, faster, and they
normally in Natuna area is escort by the coast
guard.

Sally :The Chinese
coastguard?

Minister Susi : Ya

According to Paltridge (2006) there are two patterns of adjacency pair namely first pair part and second pair part. The second pair part

is the response of the first pair part and it is known as preference structure. Those patterns found based on the analysis in the speakers' way in delivering turn-taking and also the way the speakers show their interest on question or statement.

In line with Paltridge's theory about patterns of adjacency pair, the examples above show that the utterance produced by the first speaker is a kind of adjacency pair namely announcement. Then, the positive response of called acknowledgement. The first example, Sally had announce that she reads an article about Minister Susi explode 3016 vessels, then Minister Susi gives an acceptance of her statement, and then she acknowledge that there are another hundred vessels had blamed.

Meanwhile, on second example show that Sally just confirmed on Minister Susi's implicit statement about Chinese coastguard. When Minister Susi said "yes", it means that she acknowledge and give an acceptance based on Sally's confirmation.

Based on the amount of adjacency pair patterns analysis, there were seven adjacency pair constructed in the roundtable discussion. The first pair such as: greeting, assessment, request, announcement, question, offer, and assertion. Then, second pair part patterns are about preferences. There are four preferred response, and three dispreferred response found in the discussion. Here, Minister Susi and Sally have the most turn in the discussion than the participants to the Minister Susi or to Sally.

Communicative Functions Realized in the Roundtable Discussion

According to Brown (2000: 248) states that functions of language are essentially the goals that speakers accomplish with language, and sometimes it has relationship with the forms of language. He also mentions that communication functions such as stating, requesting, responding, greeting, parting, etc. Based on the statement above the implicit or explicit message in the utterances produced by the speakers has classified into kinds of communicative functions.

Jakobson (1960) has classified communicative functions into six; referential function, poetic function, emotive function, conative function, phatic function, and the last is metalingual function. Well, the researcher gives a couple of emotive function as examples in analyzing communicative functions. Let's see the analysis below.

Datum 1

Minister Susi : I think we do very good so far. I discussed a lot with your ambassador in Jakarta. That of course our first contact in Jakarta and we do last time in the Ocean Summit in Bali. Together discussed few issues of course I would love if the American also assist us more into our island to develop industry, processing of fishing, facility, and logistic.

Datum 2

Sisi : Thanks very much Sally, thank you very much minister. You're a lot of been in my heart in this room. I speak for myself and say that's been very impressed to see what you've been able to do.

According to Jakobson (1960: 355) emotive function is a function of speech that related to the addressor, and it refers to expressive or affective. Based on the example and following by Jakobson's theory, the examples above are kind of emotive function because the speakers say an expressive or affective utterance to the addressor. The researcher found the word "very good" uttered by Minister Susi, and sentences "You're a lot of been in my heart in this room. I speak for myself and say that's been very

impressed to see what you've been able to do " uttered by participant called Sisi.

Both expressive statement above indicate that speakers feel impressed to the addressor after they have got a meeting and sharing an interesting issue. The datums show that

functions of language are essentially have implicit meaning based on its form of language.

In the discussion, there are 11 communicative functions found such as: 3 referential function, 5 emotive function, 1 phatic function, 1 poetic functions, and 1 metalingual function. In addition, the analysis of communicative functions show that Minister Susi has ten statements that related to the emotive function and she is more dominating in expressing on turn.

Power and Status Relation of the Participants

Based on transcript analysis, the researcher found some proves indicate that speakers have their own self-confident in delivering, stating, or arguing something relevant in the discussion. Then, the different level of language used reveal about who speaker is. People with prestigious social status has more dominant in every situation of conversation.

Well, in analysing about power and status relation, the researcher deals with tenor of discourse theory from many experts. According to Gerrot and Wignel (1994: 1) tenor is the social relationships between those taking parts. Moreover, Gerrot and Wignel also categorized them into three, such as: 1). status and power relation, means agents roles, peer or hierarchic relation. 2). Affect. It refers to degree of like, or dislike, or neutrality. 3). Contact, means frequency, duration and also intimacy of social context.

There are many interruption happen in the roundtable discussion produced by speakers. Let's see the datum when Minister Susi interrupting another speaker.

Datum 1

Sally : Wow, thank you for that. I mean that's not just a personal story.

Really we are talking about the important sustainability about economic and natural resources, and I have to say I think...

Minister Susi : **(interrupting) 25:21**

I have to give a part of the person because sometimes the people don't really understand how do you know about that thing. That the question.

Datum 2

Sally : but I mean, I think, I read some of you explode 3016 vessels at this point.

Sally : Okay alright, So Everyone...

Minister Susi : (Interrupting) 25:42

And to fighting of them.

For instance, Minister Susi has a lot interruption during the discussion, and she dominates it than another speakers. Second place to the speaker who interrupts during discussion is Sally, and the rest is Matt as participant of discussion. Based on the result above, Minister Susi has a high rank of interrupting in the discussion because her status as a Minister and guest speaker. Well, the power and status that Minister Susi has is reflect to the way she speaks, conveys, gives statement during the discussion, and dominating the turn than another speakers.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter mainly presents three points. First, it presents the conclusions of this study. The conclusions highlight the answers of the three research questions which are stated in the chapter I of this thesis. Second, it presents the suggestions that are elaborated for the future research and in the pedagogical implication by teachers, lecturers, and also students. Third, it presents the limitation for the future researcher to decide their focus on the studies.

In the research question number one is about how the adjacency pair patterns constructed in the roundtable discussion. The researcher found many adjacency pair patters based on the transcript analysing. Based on the result of analysis above, it can be seen that those adjacency pair patters are constructed because of the speakers in the discussion have chances to speak, delivering their idea, and also asking for

question in order to create harmony of discussion itself.

Then, in the research question number two is about how do the communicative functions realized in the discussion. According to Brown (2000: 248) states that functions of language are essentially the goals that speakers accomplish with language, and sometimes it has relationship with the forms of language. Based on the statement above the implicit or explicit message in the utterances produced by the speakers has classified into kinds of communicative functions. The researcher found there are kinds of communicative functions in the utterances produced by the speakers and those functions indicate the realization of communicative function in the roundtable discussion happen because of the speakers produce utterances, and in the utterances have the meaning and it can be classified into communicative function.

The research problem number three is about how the patterns of adjacency pair reflect to the power and status relation of the participants. According to Gerrot and Wignel (1994: 1) tenor is the social relationships between those taking parts. In line with the statement above, the researcher used theory of tenor that relates to the power and status relation in discourse. Here, Minister Susi has a lot of interruption when another speakers deliver their argument or in answering question. In another hand, Sally as moderator also has a little of frequency in interrupting another speakers, and Matt as a participant only did one interruption. In addition, Minister Susi as the highest interrupter in the discussion because she has a power and status relation in the discussion as the one and only guest, and also as an Indonesia Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. Not only about that, but also Minister Susi has SUSI Airlines, and another business that earns many infestation. In that way, Minister Susi has a special right in the roundtable discussion.

Furthermore, this present study is beneficial to the pedagogical implication, to the teachers, and lecturers can take advantages through this research and applied it to their

teaching and learning process. The last for the students, they will learn based on the analysis process of adjacency pair patterns, communicative functions, and also power and status relation in order to create a mind mapping about this topic.

REFERENCES

- Adolphs. (2003). Spoken Discourse, Grammar, and Corpus Analysis. *International Journal of English Studies. IJES. Vol. 3 (1), 2003, pp. 45-56.*
- Aijmer. (2005). Approaches to Spoken Interaction. Elsevier. *Journal of Pragmatics 37 (2005) 1743–1751.*
- Akhimien, F. (2018). A Study of the Conversational Features and Discourse Strategies in Select Sermons of Pastor E.A Adeboye. *American Journal of Linguistics 2018, 6(1): 1-8.*
- Ali, H. K. (2018). Conversation Analysis of the Structural Units of Interaction in American and Iraqi TV Talk Shows: The Doctors and Shabab Wbanat. *International Journal of Language Academy. Vol.6/2 June, p.311/333.*
- Andriyanto, F.E. (2013). Conversation Analysis on the Interview between News Reporter of New York Times and Author on Best Seller Novels. Dian Nuswantoro University.
- Ariff, Z.A., & Mugableh, A.I. (2013). Speech Act of Promising among Jordanians. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol.3 No.13; July 2013.*
- Bintana, K. (2018). the Adjacency Patterns of Trumps' Victory Interview in "60 Minutes". *EEJ 8 (1) (2018) 18-26, Universitas Negeri Semarang.*
- Boyer. (2011). Modeling Dialogue Structure with Adjacency Pair Analysis and Hidden Markov Models. *Applied Research Associates. Page 1-50.*
- Brenes. (2005). Analyzing an Oral Narrative Using Discourse Analysis Tools: Observing How Spoken Language Works. *INIE. Page: 1-19.*
- Cui, Y. (2016). Adjacency Pairs and Interactive Consciousness in Virginia Woolf's Novels. *Penn State University Press. Vol.50, No.2. Pp. 203-222.*
- Chambers. (2007). Language Learning as Discourse Analysis: Implications for the LSP Learning Environment. *ASP. Pp. 51-52.*
- Chovanec. (2009). Simulation of Spoken Interaction in Written Online Media Texts. *Brno Studies English. Vol. 35, No.2.*
- Enyi, A. U. (2015). Ethnomethodology and Social Interaction: An Analysis of Naturally Occurring Conversation in English as a Second Language. *International Journal of English and Education, Vol; 4, Issue: 2.*
- Ergul, H. (2016). Adjournments during TV watching: a Closer look into the organization of incipient talk. *Sage Journals. Vol. 18(2). Page 144-164.*
- Ermawati. Y. (2016). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs as Seen in Oprah Winfrey's Talk Show. English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Bung Hatta University.
- Fagua. (2015). Classroom Interaction: a Dynamic of Question and Answer. *Enletawa Journal n°. 8.2. July, December – 2015, pp. 15-33.*
- Fadilah, & Garnida. (2016). A Study of Conversational Structure in Television Talk Show "The Talk". Faculty of Letter, 71 Agustus 1945 University. Pp. 85-96.
- Feldman, R. (2012). Exploring essentially three-turn courses of action: An institutional case study with implications for ordinary talk. *Sage Journals. Vol 14(2). Page 217-241.*
- Gregori, S. (2000). The Tabloid Talkshow as a Quasi-Conversational Type of Face-to-Face Interaction. *International Pragmatics Association. Pragmatics 10:2.195-213 (2000).*
- Gilmartin. (2015). What's the Game and Who's Got the Ball? Genre in Spoken

- Interaction. Turn-Taking and Coordination in Human-Machine Interaction: Papers from the 2015 AAAI Spring Symposium
- Hasan, F. (2015). Adjacency Pair in “Knight and Day” Movie. Thesis. English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya.
- Isgianto, L. (2016). The Adjacency Pairs Analysis on ‘Six Minutes English Conversation Script of BBC Learning English’: a Study of Discourse Analysis. International Seminar Prasasti III: Current Research in Linguistics.
- Jamaludin, S. (2015). Motivating Students’ Skill Through Adjacency Pairs in Oral Discourse. *Dialektika Journal*, Vol.3 No; 1 March – August, 12-27.
- Jeffries, Y. (2018). Relationship between Spoken and Written Discourse of a Generation 1.5 ESL Student: A Study of a German Student in a College ESL Composition Class. *The Catesol Journal*. Pp.65-81
- Khumaidillah, N. (2016). An Analysis of Conversation Structure of Oprah Winfrey and Justin Bieber Utterances on the Oprah Winfrey Show. ICELL 2016: 18th International Conference on English Language, Literature, and Linguistics.
- Lanziti. (2014). The Conversational Outcomes of Task Implementation. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*. Page 100-117.
- Lerch, A. (2005). The Concept of Preference and Its Manifestation in Hungarian Verbal Conflict Sequences. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*. Vol. 52 (1), pp. 41_75.
- Lin. (2014). Using key part-of-speech analysis to examine spoken discourse by Taiwanese EFL learners. *Journal Cambridge*, 1st Article. Pp 1-17.
- Lingley, D. (2005). Spoken Features of Dialogue Journal Writing. *ASIAN EFL JOURNAL*, Vol.7. Issue 2, Article 3. Pp. 1-13.
- Manispuspika, Y.S. (2014). Accomplishing Coherence in Talk Show: a Comparison between English and Indonesian. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 3 No.2, January 2014, pp. 154-168.
- Martinez, R. (2003). Accomplishing closings in talk show interviews: a comparison with news interviews. *Sage Journals*. Vol. 5(3); 283-302.
- Mazeland, H. (2006). *Conversation Analysis*. Elsevier Ltd. Pp. 153-161.
- Meredith. (2014). Repair: Comparing Facebook ‘chat’ with Spoken Interaction. *Discourse & Communication*. 2014. Vol. 8 (2) 181-2017. Sage Journals.
- Mudra, H. (2018). Adjacency Pairs as Uttered in the Conversation of Sofia Coppola’s *Lost in Translation* Movie Script. *Pusat Kajian Humaniora (Center for Humanities Studies)*. Vol. 17, No.1, P.126-123.
- Mutmainah. (2016). Spoken Features of the Conversation in TV Talk Show of Talk Indonesia. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature XI/1*.
- Nurdiana. (2015). Discourse Analysis and English Language Teaching. *Universitas Bunda Mulia*. [Vol 5, No 2 \(2015\)](#)
- Olutayo. & Grace. (2013). Determinants of Turn-Taking in Nigerian Television Talk Shows. *World Journal of English Language*. Vol. 3, No. 3; 2013.
- Oviat, & Cohen. (1989). The Effect of Interaction on Spoken Discourse. *SRI International*, pp. 126-134.
- Rida. (2018). Hedges Used by Indonesian ELT Students in Written and Spoken Discourses. *IJAL*. Vol.7, No.3, 2018.
- Riggenbach. (1990). Discourse Analysis and Spoken Language Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (1990)* 11, 152-163.
- Rum, M. (2017). Discourse: Analysis: Analysing Adjacency Pairs of Teacher and Students. *STKIP – Pembangunan Indonesia Makassar*.
- Rui, T. (2014). An Analysis of Conversation Structure in *Ellen Show*. *Studies in Literature and Language*. Vol.9, No.2, 2014, pp. 37-42.

- Saj. (2012). Discourse Analysis: Personal Pronouns in Oprah Winfrey Hosting Queen Rania of Jordan. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, Vol.2, No. 6, November 2012
- Saputra. (2016). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs on English Videos Conversation by Mathematic Students of STKIP PGRI West Sumatera with Native Speaker. STKIP PGRI West Sumatera.
- Saleem. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis of Political TV Talk Show of Pakistani Media. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences* vol: 9, no:1, 2015.
- Sulistiyowati. (2010). The Speech Function in the Conversation Between Fourth Semester English Department Students of Muria Kudus University and Foreigner. Semarang State University.
- Surya. (2018). Adjacency Pairs Used by the Students of Royal Bali in Mock Class. *Jurnal Humanis, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Unud*. Vol 22.1 Pebruari 2018: 36-40.
- Suryati. (2016). Adjacency Pairs in Mata Najwa Talk Show 'Bersih-bersih Polisi' Episode: a Study of Conversation Analysis. ADLN- LIBRARY OF AIRLANGGA UNIVERSITY.
- Steve. (2011). Analyzing university spoken interaction: A CL/CA approach. Pp. 1-26
- Tamrin, H. (2016). TEACHERS' ADJACENCY PAIRS, TURN TAKING AND POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN ORDINARY CONVERSATIONS OF MTs NW AIK ANYASUKAMULIA EAST LOMBOK. *The Indonesian Journal of Language and Language Teaching*. Vol.1, No.1, Pp. 53-68.
- Vidi, I. (2012). Analysis of Adjacency Pairs and Speech Acts of Praise in Facebook. English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Binus University, Kemanggisan Ilir III No.45, Kemanggisan Palmerah, Jakarta Barat 11480, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Wiratno. (2018). Adjacency Pairs and Implicature of Utterances by President Joko Widodo in the Episode of Di Balik Dinding Istana of the Mata Najwa TV Program. Prasasti International Conference on Recent Linguistics Research. Vol. 166
- Yang. (2014). Stance and Engagement: a Corpus-based analysis of academic spoken discourse across science domains. Department of Applied English. Page: 62-78.
- Yasmin. (2012). 'Triangulation' Research Method as the Tool of Social Science Research. Dhaka: BUP Journal Volume 1 (1)
- Zhang. (2010). An Analysis of Spoken Discourse between Two Native Speakers. *Review of European Studies*. Vol. 2, No. 2; December 2010.
- Antaki, C. (2011). *Applied Conversation Analysis Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan Bou-French, Patricia.
- Brown. (2005). *Centre of English Language, Module 1*. Great Britain: University of Birmingham Press.
- Davies, Alan; Catherine Elder. (2008). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dubois, S. (1996). *The Quantitative Analysis of Turn-Taking in Multiparticipant Conversation*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania.
- Eggins, S & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Casel
- H, Schegolff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974). —A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of turn-Taking for Conversationl. USA: Linguistic Society of America
- Jakobson, R. (1960) *Linguistics and poetics*. In *Selected writings*. Vol.3. The Hague: Mouton, 18-51
- Jefferson, G. (1972). *Side Sequences*. New York: New York Free press
- Levinson, S., C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: A & C Black
- Maniruzzaman. (2006). *Introduction to English Language Study*. Dhaka: Friend Book corner
- McHoul. (2002). *How to Analyze Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*. London: A&C Black
- Rapley, T. (2008). *Doing Conversation, Discourse, and Document Analysis*. London: SAGE
- Richards, Keith; Paul Seedhouse. (2005). *Applying Conversation Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman