



The Use of Adjacency Pair Patterns in “Ancora Meet” Interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim

Beni Saptiyanto^{1✉}, Dwi Rukmini², Henrikus Joko Yulianto²

¹. SD Labschool UNNES, Semarang, Indonesia

². Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Accepted 09 May 2022

Approved 04 July 2022

Published 23

December 2022

Keywords:

Conversation

Analysis, Adjacency

Pair, Cooperative

Maxim, Implicature

Abstract

Conversation Analysis is an issue of Pragmatics. It 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, we conducted research in the field of conversation analysis. More specifically, we investigated the adjacency pair patterns, the meaning of the patterns, and the implicature of the patterns in the spoken interaction of the Ancora Meet discussion with Nadiem Anwar Makarim, Minister of Education and Culture of Indonesia, the Republic of Indonesia. This research investigates how adjacency pairs patterned in Ancora Meet’s interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim, how meaning is made through the patterns, and how the implicature resulted from using the patterns. This present study used a qualitative method. We found eight patterns of adjacency pair construct in Ancora Meet, and then three maxims were realized in the discussion. This study also reveals some patterns. Individuals prefer to communicate information implicitly rather than explicitly. Particularised dialogue implicature dominance in the discussion is evidence that speakers are connected to the context to implicate utterances in their current conversation. The particularised conversation implicature’s violation of the maxim is evidence of a significant relationship between context and cooperative principles. Conversation implicatures are almost always connected to the context. Finally, we discovered 42 instances of Minister Nadiem’s implicature, demonstrating that, for the most part, conversational implicature is always connected to context. Meanwhile, in practical contribution, this research can be used as a reference in teaching English, especially speaking.

✉Correspondence Address :

Jl. Kelud Utara III No.15, Kel. Petompon, Kec. Gajahmungkur,

Kota Semarang, Jawa Tengah 50237

E-mail: benisaptiyanto@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an activity that most people frequently use daily. They use language to communicate. Language is supposed here as a means of communication to deliver ideas, feelings, and thoughts. Richards and Schmidt (1983) say that “language is used for communication with others. When people are engaged in conversation, they share common principles of conversation that cause interpreting each other’s utterances as contributing to the conversation.” (p.20). Communication is highly needed by many of us because one cannot make contact without contact with people. The conversation takes a vital role as media to exchange data and create and maintain social relationships like friendship, negotiation of status, and social functions. Moreover, Brown (1994), and Burns and Joyce (1997), cited in Florez (1999), state that speaking is a process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving, and processing information. It often happens spontaneously, in open-ended and evolving various ways.

According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of the power of language users to pair sentences with contexts during which they might be appropriate. According to Crystal (1987) pragmatics studies, “in social interaction, we choose our language patterns, and it affects our choice on others.” (p.120). It is in line with Rosyidah and Sofwan (2017), “people use language to show people’s relationship and attitude towards others” (p.13). Theoretically, we can say some expressions we like. Practically, social rules are followed by a large number of people that constrain the way people speak.

Moreover, Tauchid and Rukmini (2016) stated that pragmatics intends 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 based on their construction. Based on the statement above, the utterances will be more evident in an issue of pragmatics called conversation analysis.

Then, Arkitson and Heritage (1984), the main objective of the conversational analysis is “the description and explication of the competencies that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction.” (p.1). Conversation analysis is a part of sociolinguistics that studies conversation. It can be defined as the interaction between two or more people involved in the conversation. According to Schiffrin (1990), “conversation analysis is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concerns with the matter of social order, and the way language both creates and is made by social context.” (p.231). Rosyidah and Sofwan (2017) state that “language shows people’s relationships and attitude towards others.” However, to keep the conversation alive, the turn-taking of communication will contribute to a good notion. Levinson (1983) says that the most common pairs in conversation analysis based on his investigation are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and repairs.

According to Levinson (1983), the “turn-taking system is related to adjacency pairs. Because it is used as techniques for choosing a next speaker (especially where an address term is included or the content of the first utterance of the pair isolates a relevant next speaker)”. (p.303). The other name of adjacency pairs is preference structure. It means that both one utterance and another utterance in conversation analysis are connected. Tracy argued that (2002) there are many adjacency pairs. Some pairs involve similar acts like greeting and saying goodbye/parting, while others involve different actions, like invitations or offers. They are followed by acceptance or refusal, and answers follow questions. Here are two examples of common adjacency pairs in English taken from Tracy (2002). These adjacency pairs involve different acts. Example (1) accepts an invitation, and example (2) refuses an invitation, as follows:

- 1) Taryn: How about lunch? (Invitation)
Jay : Sounds good. (Acceptance)
- 2) Taryn : How about some lunch? (Invitation)
Jay : (Pause) Uh-hh, better not. I’ve got to get this done by 2:00. Thanks, though. How’s tomorrow? (Refusal)

In addition, people make conversation to communicate, and it needs an agreement in action, sense, or feeling to deliver the ideas of its meaning. It can be seen when someone greets another person. The first person will welcome, and the pairs will provide a response or vice versa. These pairs reflect that the adjacency pair is successfully achieved.

In this research, we have found the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, Nadiem Anwar Makarim, as the subject of the study. In short, people know that Minister Nadiem Anwar Makarim is the youngest Minister in President Joko Widodo's 2019-2024 working cabinet. Then, as a minister, he declares the concept of "freedom of learning," which liberates education institutions and encourages children to be innovative and promote creative thinking.

On the other hand, Minister Nadiem was a founder of *Gojek* in 2010 before being appointed Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. He brings so many advantages to create a good way of conveying jobs in the education system in Indonesia with many innovations. The excellent policy in education that Minister Nadiem has implemented is that the national exam in 2021 will be changed to assess minimum competency and survey of character. It consists of language (literacy), the ability of math (numeracy), and the strengthening of character education.

Moreover, many people show their pride and are impressed because Minister Nadiem has a unique educational background. He attended high school in Jakarta and the United World College of Southeast Asia (UWC SEA) in Singapore. Then, he went to Brown University for a B.An in International Relations. He did his M.B.A. at Harvard Business School in the U.S. Based on his educational background; he does not have experience in the education system. He made headlines when he announced his controversial education policy program, "Freedom of Learning." The policy he stated is the termination of the national exam in 2021.

Meanwhile, the writer tries to conduct research based on the unique characteristics of

Minister Nadiem in the way of turn-taking, delivering, and answering in the discussion. The writer also relies on the theory and result of the previous study to enrich the development. The previous studies are divided into some categories. The first category deals with conversation features based on the genre of conversation features in spoken text conducted by Martinez (2003); see also Sharon and Philip, 2005; Ammendrup (2011); Saleem (2015); Fadilah and Garnida (2016); Kamil, 2018). In this category, there is an example of a previous study conducted by Martinez (2003); he investigates how talk show interviews were brought to an end. The conclusion of his research is to close in both genres that share features relating to the structural organization and the participants' behavior which can be accounted for in terms of the institutional context in which the speech events occur.

The second category dealt with conversational analysis on T.V. programs in spoken text. The previous studies related to this section have been conducted by Manipuspika (2014); Olutayo (2013); Rui & Ting (2014); Sumbayak (2010); Vickova (2006). These studies discussed how conversation features happen between the speakers on T.V. programs like talk shows. Moreover, the research object is Ellen's show, so the data rely on spoken text. Based on the investigation, Ellen's presentation on YouTube has an entertainment side, and it shows the whole conversation produced by speakers. The conversation structure, like turning and taking the way between speakers, try to open and close, depending on a particular situation.

The third category dealt with preferences conducted by Ahiemen (2018; see also Cheng (2016); Lanziti (2014); Lerch (2005); Mazeland (2006); Sulistyowati (2010). These studies clarify the nature of preference, considering that this research used the concept of conversation, which is a crucial part of interpreting some utterances that seem confused and vague over time. Moreover, these researches investigated the kinds of social organizations used as resources when people communicate through talk in interaction. The result indicated the types of second-order

validation of the theory development. In short, the adjacency pair patterns are marked with conversation analyses that the speakers produce.

The fourth category dealt with the model of adjacency pairs conducted by Adisty (2012); Andriyanto (2013); Ariff and Mugableh (2013); Boyer (2011); Enyi (2015); Feldman and Robinson (2012); Iswara (2019); Jamaludin (2015); Surya (2018); Tamrin (2016); Vidi (2012). Yanti (2008) attempts to answer McCarthy's (2000) theory about adjacency pairs of invitation and to figure out what types of adjacency pairs are created by lecture and how to analyze using the adjacency pair theory proposed by Couldhard and Paltridge. Moreover, detecting dialogue structure with corpora of human dialogue is the subject of increasing attention.

Iswara conducted the fifth category about patterns of adjacency pairs (2019; see also Andriyanto (2013); Ariff and Mugableh, 2013; Enyi, 2015; Mudra, 2018; Vidi, 2012). For instance, Iswara's research figures out power and status relations in discourse. In his research, the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Mrs Susi Pudjiastuti, has many interruptions when the speakers deliver their argument in answering the question. Moreover, the host also has a minor frequency in interrupting other speakers, and the audience did one interruption. In conclusion, Susi Pudjiastuti caused many disruptions because she had a power and status relation in that discussion.

The last previous studies dealt with the realization of maxim flouting to create humor in incredible two by Abualadas (2020); see also Aristyani and Djoko (2020); Budiati (2012); Fahmi (2016); Fauziah and Issy (2020); Fitriyani and Mujiyanto (2020); Giriyani and Perni (2020); Hassani (2019); Nurfarwati and Anisa (2018); Pradika and Garna (2018); Putri and Dewangga (2019); (Rafika, Yulliasri, and Warsono (2020); Raharja and Satria (2019); Soedjarwo (2020); Ulfah and Syifa (2018) The result of his research showed the ways how humor are generated through the flouting of maxim. The study indicates that maxim flouting is an effective way to improve communication skills when teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

Moreover, maxim flouting EFL teachers should exploit Grice's maxim to create a communicative atmosphere in their English classroom relying on their teaching style of cooperation, which enhances the students' communication ability.

Well, in this present study, we deal with three research problems: 1) How are adjacency pairs patterned in the "Ancora Meet" interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim; 2) How is meaning made through the patterns in the "Ancora Meet" interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim; 3) How does implicature result from the use of the patterns in "Ancora Meet" interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim.

The study's objectives are to explain how adjacency pairs are patterned in the text, to illustrate the meaning that is made through the use of the patterns, and to show the implicature that results from the use of the practices. The result of this study is expected to contribute theoretical, practical, and pedagogical benefits. The results of the first research problem are expected to enrich resources by the researcher and future researchers and give the students of the English program knowledge about the kinds of adjacency pairs. Then pedagogically, this result can motivate lecturers and students to be more concerned about adjacency pair patterns to recognize the essence of an implicit message during the conversation. Practically, the development is aimed to enrich the readers' point of view or interpretation in analyzing adjacency pair patterns as research or simply practicing in their spare time. Second, to teach the students about adjacency pair patterns. Pedagogically, to motivate both lecturers and students to be more concerned about constructing adjacency pair patterns to acknowledge the essence of an implicit message during the conversation. Practically, to enrich the readers' perspective or interpretation in analyzing adjacency pair patterns as research or simply practicing in their spare time. Third, to give the following researcher significance to enrich the theoretical bases of Grice's maxims in the adjacency pair patterns. Pedagogically, to motivate the lecturers and students to pay more attention and learn about Grice's maxim in spoken interaction. Practically, to enhance the

students or the readers' insight into analyzing Grice's maxims in daily activity.

METHOD

This current study used descriptive qualitative with written discourse analysis. This study investigates the adjacency pair patterns using Paltridge (2006) as the leading theory, the problems concerning the meaning made through the patterns using Grice (1975) as the leading theory, and the implicature result from using the patterns interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim. The subject of this research was the host, Nadiem Anwar Makarim, and two people at "Ancora Meet." In contrast, the object of this research was the dialogue between the presenter and Nadiem Anwar Makarim.

For this study, we, as the key instrument, played the data collector, data analyst, and data reporter roles. This research used the theory of Paltridge (2006) as the instrument to collect the data. The instrument was in the form of a table. In collecting the data, there were several procedures in this study which were presented as follows: (1) Searching the video Fireside Chat with Gojek Founder Nadiem Anwar Makarim through YouTube, (2) Downloading the video and the transcription on YouTube, (3) Watching the video, (4) Paying attention to the conversation between the host, Nadiem Anwar Makarim, and two people at "Ancora Meet," which consist of the patterns, the meaning, and the implicature using the patterns, (5) Selecting the conversations reflected on all the video conversations, (6) identifying and classifying the adjacency pair patterns, meaning of the patterns, and the implicature of the patterns into the table, (7) calculating their occurrence, (8) stating the adjacency pair patterns, the meaning of the patterns, and the implicature of the patterns, (9) interpreting all the finding, and (10) concluding.

After the data were collected, it was analyzed by Paltridge (2006). Firstly, the data were collected based on the categories of the adjacency pair patterns. Next, we ordered the meaning through the designs; last, we showed the

implicature that resulted from using the patterns. After that, the data were reported qualitatively, and then the conclusion of this research was drawn. This research validation process was done through two kinds of triangulation: theory and investigator. For theory triangulation, the theory of Paltridge (2006) and Grice (1975) were used in describing categories of adjacency pair patterns, the meaning, and the implicature.

We applied triangulation to ensure that the research was credible and that the findings and interpretations were accurate. This is a process of corroborating evidence from different individuals, types of data, or methods of data collection (Creswell, 2012). From one of those options, this study sought evidence from a different individual, especially a person who is an expert in discourse studies. The findings were submitted to an expert and examined to see whether or not the researcher misinterpreted the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Adjacency Pair Patterns in the Conversation

According to Paltridge (2006), there are two patterns of adjacency pair, namely the first and second. The second pair part is the response of the first part, known as the preference structure. Those patterns were found based on the analysis of the speakers' way of delivering turn-taking and how the speakers showed their interest in the question or statement. Based on the analysis, the number of adjacency pair patterns in this study can be summarized in the following.

Table 1. Adjacency Patterns

No.	Adjacency Pair Patterns	Frequency
1	Invitation—Acceptance/ Refusal	2
2	Announcement— Acknowledgement	1
3	Assessment—Agreement/ Disagreement	12
4	Question—Expected/ Unexpected Answer	13
5	Request—Acceptance	1

6	Assertion—Agreement	1
7	Command—Compliance	1
8	Greeting—Greeting	1
Total		22

Based on the table above, we found 22 adjacency pair patterns in the “Ancora Meet” interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim. Moreover, the highest adjacency pair patterns belong to the question—expected and unexpected answer. In this case, the result showed that the second position belongs to adjacency pair patterns assessment. Here is an example of analyzing adjacency pair patterns, namely question.

Datum 1

Gita Wirjawan : “Did they know that you only had two million dollars?”

Nadiem A. Makariem : “Yes, of course, they knew.”

Datum 2

Gita Wirjawan : “Do you mitigate the risk of our falling into a cliff in the next day, year, decade, or century?”

Nadiem A. Makariem : “I think I’m not against regulation.”

Paltridge (2006) identified the first and second pair part as the two types of adjacency pair patterns. The first pair pattern, also known as the preference structure, responds in the second pair part. These patterns were discovered by studying the speakers’ turn-taking patterns and their expressions of interest in the statement or inquiry.

In line with Paltridge’s theory about patterns of adjacency pair, the example above shows that utterance produced by the first speaker is a kind of adjacency pair, namely question. Then, the positive response is called the expected answer. In the first example, Gita asked Nadiem if he had two million dollars, then Nadiem gave an acceptance of his statement, and then he answered that they (the public) knew that Nadiem had two million dollars.

Meanwhile, the second example shows that Nadiem gave an implicit statement about mitigating the risk of falling into a cliff in the next day, decade, or century. When Nadiem said, “I

think I’m not against regulation,” he gave an unexpected answer based on Gita’s confirmation.

Based on the amount of adjacency pair patterns analysis, eight adjacency pairs were constructed in the Ancora Meet. The first pair includes invitation, announcement, assessment, question, request, assertion, command, and greeting. Then, the second pair part patterns are about preferences. There are seven preferred responses and six dispreferred responses found in the discussion. Here, Nadiem and Gita have the most turn in the discussion than the participants to Minister Nadiem or Gita.

The Meaning of the Patterns in the Conversation

The second research problem in this study dealt with maxims. Grice (1975) introduced the cooperation concept as a discussion principle. To minimize miscommunication between the speaker and the hearer, people must follow the guidelines of the cooperative principle. It was a significant communication problem; they spoke based on what they knew and were unconcerned about the listener’s background. Grice has classified four fundamental maxims that the speaker should follow as a guideline during communication under the cooperation principle. There is the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner, and the maxim of relevance. We provided types of maxims found during the discussion. Look at the table below:

Table 2. The Occurrence of Maxims Found in the Patterns

No.	Types of Maxims	Frequency
1	Maxim of Quality	1
2	Maxim of Quantity	14
3	Maxim of Manner	0
4	Maxim of Relevance	2
Total		17

Based on the table above, we found 17 maxims in discussion with Nadiem Anwar Makarim at the ancora meet. Moreover, the highest maxims belonged to the maxim of quantity. In this case, the result showed that the second position belonged to the maxim of

relevance. Thus, the result showed that the third position belonged to the maxim of quality. The last result showed the maxim of manner.

Well, we give examples of emotive functions in analyzing communicative functions. Let's see the analysis below.

Datum 1

Gita Wirjawan : “Do you sense that you’ve learned more from your failures or earlier successes?”

Nadiem A. Makarim : “I don’t learn anything from my successes at all. It makes me feel good.

Uh, it makes other people feel good and makes people respect you and get the headlines and get you deals”.

Datum 2

Gita Wirjawan : “You vape?”

Nadiem A. Makarim : “Yes, **but...**

Gita Wijawan : “That’s smoking!”

According to Levinson (1985), the Gricean cooperative principle is understood as a communication theory; it has the fascinating consequence of explaining how communication may be accomplished in the lack of traditional methods for communicating the desired message. The cooperative principles are also defined by Levinson (1983) as “what players must do to preserve in a maximum efficient, logical, and cooperative manner: they must talk truthfully, relevantly, and clearly while offering adequate information” (p.102). Moreover, we found the sentence, “**Uh, it makes other people feel good and makes people respect you and get the headlines and get you deals,**” uttered by Nadiem A. Makarim in datum 1. The finding showed that the speaker gave more information than was required. This condition caused ineffective conversation because of unnecessary information.

While in datum 2, this study’s problem deals with the quality maxim’s flouting. The flouting of the quality maxim happened if the participant lied or denied something that was believed to be false in order not to get some punishment from someone else. Then, the participant tried to deny it when he rebelled. Those utterances were taken from Gita Wirjawan and Nadiem A. Makarim’s conversation. When

Gita asked Nadiem if he did vape, Nadiem said, “Yes, **but...**” from his statement, he did the quality maxim.

The Implicature of the Patterns in the Conversation

The third research problem in this study deals with the implicature of the patterns in conversation. Grice initially presented the theory of implicature in 1975. In his view, implicature is a condition where a speaker conveys a different meaning from the surface utterance they express. Based on the theory from the expert above, we found the data to prove any implicature during the conversation. Here is the table about the types of implicature in conversation during the discussion.

Table 3. The Types of Implicature Found in Conversation

No.	Types of Implicature	Frequency
1	Conventional Implicature	13
2	Conversational Implicature	29
Total		42

Based on the table above, we found two types of implicature in conversation; the total of the implicature was 42 among the speakers at the ancora meet. Moreover, as presented in the table above, the types of implicature were more dominant than the traditional implicature. Here is an example of the implicature produced by the speaker.

Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is the implicature that is general and traditional. In general, everyone knows and understands a case’s meaning or impact. According to Grice (1975), conversational implicature is determined by the purpose of a sentence. (p.25). This is in line with Potts (2005). A sentence cannot be used with its conventional meaning without implicating its conventional implicatures. (p35). At the ancora discussion, Nadiem Anwar Makarim showed 13 conventional implicatures during the debate. This

happened because when the host and the guest asked him, he said the information clearly during the conference. To clarify, we give a sample datum of conventional implicature. Here are the samples of traditional implicature produced by the speaker:

Datum 1

Gita Wirjawan : “**Do you sense that you’ve learned more from your failures or earlier successes?**”

Nadiem A. Makarim : “**I don’t learn from my successes at all.**”

The example above showed that Gita asked a short question to Nadiem what he had learned from all his failures all this time. Hence, the aims of this statement above that Gita made could indicate that he wanted to know about Nadiem’s evaluation of his failures or earlier successes. In short, datum 1 showed that the conversation in the dialogue above contained conventional conversation implicature. The statement “I didn’t learn from my success at all” means that not everyone learns from failures. Sadock (1978) states “that all non-truth-conditional components of what is transmitted by an utterance purely owing to the words or forms the phrase includes in conversation implicatures.” (p. 282). Then, another statement in this section produced by Gita Wirjawan, when he asked Nadiem Makarim, “*When did you decide to conceive the idea of a go-jek?*” Nadiem Anwar Makarim answered, “*It’s around 2008/2009*”. Based on the statement above, the host wanted to know when Nadiem Anwar Makarim got the gojek idea. Moreover, Nadiem Anwar Makarim gave a clear answer to the host. He said that he got the idea of go-jek in 2008/2009. The response produced by Nadiem Anwar Makarim meant that not everyone

conceived the idea of a go-jek. In addition, the second conversation belonged to the conventional exchange. This is in line with Potts (2005). A sentence cannot be used with its traditional meaning without implicating its conventional implicatures.

Conversational Implicature

In conclusion, in everyday communication, through conversational implicatures that have occurred, a sentence can be classified into various types of behavior that can connect a conversation. The implied meaning that sometimes appears in a conversation will direct a speech partner who is part of the conversation. Contributions in each communication carried out as a follow-up with different functions will determine the goals of the conversation achieved. Austin (1962) argues that a series of communicative acts are used in a systematic way to accomplish specific goals. The various types of communicative acts found in everyday life make an implicature that can be realized according to the respective goals desired by each speaker in a conversation. Every action the speaker takes must be equated with its usefulness based on something to be achieved. The relationship between the goals that can be realized through this communicative act makes the conversational implicatures that occur will get an absolute value of clarity. To clarify, the researcher gives a sample datum of conversational conversation implicature. Here are the samples of conversational conversation implicature produced by the speaker:

Datum 2

Gita Wirjawan : “**How long did it take for that process?**”

Nadiem A. Makarim : “**And I’m like, I can’t because if your goal is to create a unicorn, you’re very high to achieve it, right?**”

Datum 2 showed that Gita asked his guest, Nadiem. He asked how long Nadiem needed the process (*Gojek*). He replied, “**And I’m like, I can’t because if your goal is to create a unicorn, you’re very high to achieve it, right?**”. The statement made by Nadiem had another implication, namely that he did not know precisely when a process was needed.

This research has contributed to the relevant aspects, which are theoretical and practical. The speculative element deals with the contribution to the theories, approaches, and studies of linguistic research.

The theoretical contribution implicates the theory development of linguistics, especially conversation analysis and adjacency pairs. It can be used as a reference in pragmatics or semantics studies. The use of adjacency pairs patterns teaches us how to conduct good verbal communication, especially in a formal situation. It also helps us analyze the conversation's structure and the meaning behind the response.

In practical contribution, this research can be used to teach English, especially speaking. The conversation that has been analyzed can be used as a learning practice for students to increase their verbal communication ability. Not only the patterns but also the moral value behind the conversation style conducted by the speaker can be used as a learning reference in conducting good communication. Students will know how to give a good response in many ways.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown how adjacency pair patterns are constructed in the Ancora Meet. We found many adjacency pair patterns based on the transcript analysis. Based on the research, it can be seen that adjacency pair patterns are constructed because speakers at the Ancora Meet have chances to speak, deliver their idea and also ask questions. The second question of this study examines how meaning is created through patterns. We found some conversational maxims in the transcript or the utterances produced by the speakers. They are the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, and the maxim of relevance. So, it can be said that the maxim used by the second speaker is maxim quantity. It can happen because the second speaker provides too much information for the answer. In short, it can be implied that the speaker was trying to hide the actual activities he was doing during joining go food competition. This research is successfully showing the implicature that arises from using patterns. The implicit meaning of utterances is examined in the pragmatics notion, which means that communication between speakers and listeners has a specific goal distinct from the form of the language employed. The use of language

frequently has a concealed or indirect aim. It may be characterized as implicature when it comes to implicit meaning. We found that Nadiem Anwar Makarim did a lot of maxims of quantity. It means that he tried to explain much to the audience about how he found the application of *Gojek*. In short, this research has some drawbacks. There is a possibility that different types of implicature may overlap with each other. This research does not involve experimentation, so the causality proposed by the speakers might not be as accurate as expected. These drawbacks can be points of improvement for future research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Adisty, F. R. (2012). Sociolinguistics analysis of adjacency pair patterns in the classroom scenes of freedom writers the movie. *Quill Journal*, 1(1), 15–21.
- Ammendrup, M. S. (2011). Nonverbal expressions of turn management in tv interviews: A cross cultural study between greek and icelandic. *Hanes Journals*, 2(3), 207–213.
- Andriyanto, E. F. (2013). Conversation analysis on the interview between news reporter of New York times and author on bestseller novels. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7(3), 67–75.
- Ariff, Z. A and Mugableh, A. I. (2013). Speech act of promising among Jordanians. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(13), 1–19.
- Aristyani, Yullia Ayu, Djoko Sutopo, I. Y. (2020). The realization of maxim flouting to create humour in incredibles 2. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 351–360.
- Arkitson, J. M & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boyer, K. E. (2011). Modeling dialogue structure with adjacency pair analysis and hidden markov models. *Journal of Applied Research Associates*, 2(5), 1–15.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in*

- language usage (Vol. 4)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Budiati. (2012). Politeness maxim in the film laskar pelangi. *Register Journal*, 5(2), 51–60.
- Cheng, T. P. (2016). Conversational analysis and second language interaction. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 57(20), 29–40.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis (New edition)*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. (2004). *An introduction to discourse analysis (2nd ed)*. Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (1987). Toward a “bucket” theory of language disability: Taking account of interaction between linguistic levels. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 1(1), 13.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse, a Resource Book for Student*.
- Drew, Paul and Heritage, J. (2006). *Conversation analysis: Institutional interactions (4th ed.)*. Sage.
- Enyi, A. (2015). Ethnomethodology and social interaction: An analysis of naturally occurring conversation in English as a second language. *International Journal of English and Education*, 4(2), 365–382.
- Fadilah, S and Garnida, C. S. (2016). A study of conversational structure in television talk show “the talk.” *Journal of Plan African Studies*, 15(2), 85–96.
- Fahmi, R. (2016). An analysis of Grice’s maxim violation in daily conversation. *Journal of Language and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 91–97.
- Fauziah, Rizka, Issy Yuliasri, D. R. (2020). The flouting of Grice’s cooperative maxims in the dialogues in Pearls before Swine. *English Education Journal*, 10(2), 164–173.
- Feldman, K. H and Robinson, D. J. (2012). Exploring essentially three turn courses of action: An institutional case study with implications for ordinary talk. *Sage Journals*, 12(2), 217–241.
- Fitriyani, Atika, Januarius Mujiyanto, S. (2020). The impact of grice maxims infringement in adventure of tintin towards communication purposes. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 266–272.
- Florez, M. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners’ speaking skills. *ERIC Digest*.
- Giriyani, Pemi, E. (2020). Flouting maxims on the dialogue of characters in up. *Profesional Journal of English Education*, 3(4), 512–515.
- Grice, H. Paul. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. Oxford University Press.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), *Syntax and semantics volume 3: Speech act (3rd ed.)*. Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. Arnold, a member of the Hodder Headline Group.
- Hardwood, C. (2006). *Discourse analysis: A study of turn-taking in a scripted conversation*. University of Toronto.
- Hassani, N. (2019). The flouting maxim on twitter influencers’ tweets. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(2), 139–155.
- Hutchby, I. and R. W. (2008). *Conversation analysis (2nd ed.)*. Polity Press.
- Iswara, J. W., Rukmini, D., & Widhiyanto, W. (2019). The adjacency pair patterns in spoken interaction of roundtable discussion with Susi Pudjiastuti. *English Education Journal*, 9(3), 297–299.
- Jamaludin, S. (2015). Motivatifig students’ skill through adjacency pairs in oral discourse. *Dialektika Journal*, 3(1), 12–27.
- Lanziti, L. (2014). The conventional outcomes of task implementation. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 6(3), 100–117.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Lerch, A. (2005). The concept of preference and its manifestation in Hungarian verbal conflict sequences. *Journal of Acta Linguistica Hungaria*, 52(1), 41–75.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Manipuspika, Y. S. (2014). Accomplishing coherence in talk shows: A comparison between english and indonesian. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 154–168.
- Martinez, R. (2003). Accomplishing closings in talk show interviews: A comparison with

- news interviews. *Sage Journals*, 5(3), 283–302.
- Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation analysis. *Elsevier Journal*, 3(7), 153–163.
- Nurfarwati, Dian, Siti Nur Anisa, R. Y. (2018). The analysis of flouting of conversational maxims on the main characters in moana movie. *Profesional Journal of English Education*, 1(5), 677–686.
- Olutayo, O. G. (2013). Determinants of turn taking in nigerian television talk shows. *World Journal of English Language*, 3(3), 67–77.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An Introduction*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Pillet-Shore, D. M. (2017). Preference organization. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication. *Journal of Acta Linguistica Hungaria*, 31(3), 2.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conversational Implicatures*. Oxford University Press.
- Pradika, Bayu Garna, K. A. P. R. (2018). An analysis of flouting maxims in coco movie. *Profesional Journal of English Education*, 1(5), 657–663.
- Pratama, Hendi, Joko Nurkamto, Rustono, S. M. (2017). Second Language Learners' Comprehension of Conversational Implicatures in English. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23(3), 50 – 66.
- Putri, Anindita Dewangga, F. R. B. (2019). Analysis of humor on cartoon comics be like bro. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 13–22.
- Rafika, Rahmi, Issy Yulliasri, Warsono, W. (2020). Flouting of Grice's maxim in the humorous utterances in american situation comedy 2 broke girls. *English Education Journal*, 10(4), 474–479.
- Raharja, Ahmad U Satria, A. R. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principal violation by Dodit Mulyanto in stand-up comedy Indonesia season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 43–61.
- Richards, J. C. and R. W. S. (1983). *Applied linguistic and language study*. Longman Group Limited.
- Rosyidah, I. F., & Sofwan, A. (2017). Politeness strategies in official facebook accounts of CNN, TWSJ and N.B.C. on Obama Visiting Hiroshima. *English Education Journal*, 7(1), 13.
- Rui, K & Ting, S. (2014). *An analysis of conversation structure in Ellen show*. *Journal of Studies in Literature and Language*, 9(2), 37–42.
- Sadock, J. M. (1978). *On Testing for Conversational Implicature*. University of Chicago.
- Saleem, S. (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*, 9(1), 115–122.
- Schegloff, E. A. and H. S. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327.
- Schiffirin, D. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 3–16.
- Schiffirin, D. (1994). *Approach to discourse*. Blackwell.
- Shiri, S. and H. A. (2020). The influence of topic management on the speaking ability of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 9(3), 63.
- Soedjarwo, G. N. (2020). Persuasion act in the proposal movie. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 2(1), 50–67.
- Sulistiyowati, T. (2010). The speech functions in the conversations between the fourth semester english department students of muria kudus university and some foreigners. *English Education Journal*, 8(1), 115–122.
- Surya, F. K. and N. S. (2018). Adjacency pairs used by the students of royal Bali in mock class. *Jurnal Humanis, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Unud*, 22(1), 36–40.
- Tamrin, H. (2016). Teachers' adjacency pairs, turn taking and politeness strategies in ordinary conversations of M.T.S. N.W.

- The Indonesian Journal of Language and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 53–68.
- Tauchid, A., & Rukmini, D. (2016). The performance of expressive speech acts as found on Wayne Rooney's facebook. *English Education Journal*, 1, 1–10.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
- Tracy, K. (2002). *Everyday talk: Building and reflecting identities (N. York (ed.))*. Guilford Press.
- Vickova, J. (2006). *Language of internet relay chat [Masarykiana University]*.
- Wei, Z., and Wenfeng, Z. (2015). The violation of the maxims in Conan. 11(3), 22–25.
- Wu, Y. (2013). Conversation analysis--A discourse approach to teaching oral English skills. *International Education Studies*, 6(5), 89.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pracmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Zebua, Esterani, Dwi Rukmini, M. S. (2017). The violation and flouting of cooperative principles in the Ellen degeneres discussion. *Journal Lof Language and Literature*, 103–113.