

Adjacency Pair of Conversation on Interactional Discourse in High School Learning

Wiwini Widiyastuti^{1✉} & Rustono²

¹ Public Senior High School 1 Karanganyar, Demak, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:
October 2018
Accepted:
November 2018
Published:
December 2018

Keywords:

*adjacency pair,
conversation,
interactional discourse*

Abstract

In interactional discourse, the learning between teacher and students is preferably the delivery of intentions to the interlocutor. There are often implicit intentions in these interactions. The objective of this study is to describe the adjacency pair in the conversations of teacher and students in interactional discourse in high school learning. Data were collected by observation method with uninvolved conversation observation technique. Data analysis was conducted by using pragmatic methods with heuristic techniques. Based on research studies, it shows that eleven adjacency pair, including interlocutor of greeting, call-answer, complaint-aid, complaint-apologies, request-allow, request-giving information, request-offer, request-acceptance, assignment-approval, offer-acceptance, and proposal-acceptance. Practically, the research results are useful as input to teachers that there are various language characteristics of high school students that must be considered.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i3.28523>

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondence address:

Raya Cangkring, No. 08, Cangkring, Karanganyar,
Demak, Jawa Tengah, 59582
E-mail: widiyastutiwiwin@gmail.com

[p-ISSN 2301-6744](#)

[e-ISSN 2502-4493](#)

INTRODUCTION

Effective conversations between teacher and students can be observed through interactions that occur in the learning process. This is in line with the opinion of Ariyanti, and Zulaeha (2017) that speech acts in learning interactions are one of the interesting language studies to be studied because they are not only related to linguistic aspects but also socio-cultural aspects.

The principle of language learning is how to use language by paying attention to cultural and multicultural insights. This is by the objectives of Indonesian language learning which refers to the education pillar programmed by the Ministry of National Education (in Zulaeha, 2016), they are, understanding Indonesian regarding form, meaning and function, and using it appropriately and creatively for various purposes, needs and circumstances. These objectives can be realized using the appropriate methods and approaches.

One approach that is in line with the times and changes in learning interactions is the communicative approach. The characteristic of the communicative approach is to apply language learning in the interaction of various opportunities. The official opportunity or situation that occurs in the school environment is interactive learning between teacher and students. The purpose of interactional discourse learning is to realize the delivery of the purpose of conversation accompanied by social relations between speakers and Interlocutor (Arifin, Matanggui, Yulianto, Nurtriputra, Hilaliyah, Wiyanti, 2015). Social relations are not often manifested in the form of conversations that intentionally or not contain implicit intentions. The implied proposition or purpose is called implicature. This is revealed by Rustono (1999) that conversational implicature is a pragmatic implication found in conversations that arise as a result of the principle of conversation.

Since interactional learning is carried out by teacher and students, both parties engage in paired conversations. An adjacent speech pair or adjacency pair in communication is essential

because it will affect the communication harmony of the interlocutor. Meanwhile, Sack (in Purwoko, 2008) argues that the concepts of adjacency pair are (1) speech, (2) produced by different speakers, (3) arranged as one first and one second part, (4) has a type, so that a certain first part needs a certain second part.

The social relations that are embodied in the speech pairs are arranged in a pattern called the Levinson preference structure (in Yule, 2014). Exposure to adjacency pair can also use the principle of Coulthard adjacency pair (Permatasari, 2017). The pattern of speech includes greetings, call-answers, complaint-help, an complaint apology, request-allow, requests for information-giving information, requests -offers, and offer-rejection. Research on adjacency pair was also conducted by Bintana, Rukmini, and Sofwan (2018). The study examined the adjacency pair in the 60 Minutes interview. In qualitative descriptive research that uses data in the form of question patterns and patterns of praise and introduction, it is found that the adjacency pair given by respondents are asking, allowing, asking for, reminding, and introducing. The research of other adjacency pair was conducted by Ermawati, Yanti, and Elfiondri (2015), Arum (2015), Isgianto (2016), Martyawati (2014), Yusandra (2017), Astuti (2018), and Mudra (2018).

Based on the literature review that is stated before, the research of the adjacency pair in the conversations of teacher and students has never been conducted. The purpose of this study is to identify adjacency pair in the conversations of teacher and students in interactional discourse in high school learning. Therefore, the benefits of this study are as a scientific contribution of pragmatics, especially adjacency pair.

METHODS

The approach used in this study consisted of theoretical approaches and methodological approaches. The theoretical approach used was a pragmatic approach that was used in analyzing adjacency pair. The methodological approach in this study was a qualitative descriptive approach.

The approach was by Sugiyono (2015) opinion that qualitative methods were used for natural research objects, researchers as key instruments, the sampling of data sources were done purposively, collection techniques in various ways, and inductive.

The method of data collection, through observation method with the tapping technique, in line with the opinion of Sudaryanto (2015). The data collection technique used was uninvolved conversation observation Technique and writing technique. The researcher listened to the conversations of teacher and students in the international discourse in high school learning. Then, a recording of the data obtained was carried out. The data obtained were tested for their validity by using triangulation techniques and then analyzed by using pragmatic methods of heuristic techniques. After that, the data were presented informally.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion in this study, concerning the adjacency pair of teacher and students in interactional discourse in high school learning.

Interlocutor of Greetings

Context: Teacher greets and motivates students who are practicing.

Teacher : **Keep the spirit, My students!**

Students : **Yes, Sir!**

In the fragment of the conversation, the teacher's speech, "*Keep the spirit, My Students!*" Contains a greeting called "*My Students.*" Students who receive the teacher's greeting respond to the teacher's speech by saying, "*Yes, sir!*". In the speech of the students, there is a greeting as teacher's speech response, "*Sir*" So, in the conversation between teacher and students, greeting speeches are paired with greetings.

Interlocutor Call-Answer

Context: Teacher calls on students named Siti Zulaekah. However, because the teacher is wrong in saying it, another student's friend corrects it.

Teacher : **Siti Sulaikah!**

Student : Zulaekah!

Student 2 : ***Hadiroh!***

Teacher's speech, "*Siti Sulaekah,*" in the fragment of the conversation is the call of speech. Students intended by the teacher does not directly answer speech calls. Other students answer the educator's call with the name correction spoken by the teacher. After the name is corrected, the intended student answers with the answer, "*Hadiroh.*" The speech of the students is an answer in Arabic. So, in the conversations of teacher and students in the interactional discourse learning, the speech call of the educator in pairs with the speech of the answers of the students.

Interlocutor of Complaint-Help

Context: The classroom atmosphere is not conducive, and the teacher tries to handle the students to be ready to receive learning.

Teacher : **Listen!**

Students : **Shhh!**

Students : Are you ready?

Students : Ready.

There is a complaint-help speech that is told by the teacher and students indirectly in the fragment of the conversation. The utterances of complaints that were told by the Teacher, "*Listen,*" are used to convey complaints about the classroom atmosphere that is not conducive and to seek the attention of students. Meanwhile, the utterances of help given by students to the teacher in the form of utterances, "*Shhh,*" to ask other students to calm down and pay attention to the Teacher. Therefore, in the conversation fragments of the teacher and the students, the complaints are paired with the utterances of help.

Context: Every practice of sports, the teacher gives the task to the students in turn to record the results of the practice obtained by other students.

Teacher : **Come on! Did no one write the results?**

Student : I am, sir. I have finished it.

Teacher : Yes, like that. In turn.

Through the conversation, the teacher says, "*Come on! Did no one write the results?*" "*Did no one write the results?*" Which is a complaint

statement delivered to students? The complaints are spoken indirectly are responded to by students with the help utterances, "*I am, sir. I have finished it.*". Indirectly, students provide help to the teacher. Based on the analysis of the conversation fragments of the teacher and the students, the complaint speech paired up with the utterances of help.

Interlocutor of Complaint-Apology

Context: The teacher asks the students who succeed in practice to repeat.

Teacher : Do it again, but just a little. A quarter means do not give too much yeast. With a note, you must, the steps of the practice must be by the recipe.

I am surprised with you. You have correct recipe. You have already a consultation before.

I explained one by one; you say "I have understood.

Student : **I have understood, Ma'am. However, just this.**

Speech of Teacher's complaint, "*I am surprised with you. You have correct recipe. You have already a consultation before. I explained one by one; you say "I have understood"*" in the fragments conversation is a form of disappointment. The teacher has made explanations and coaching regularly, but the results obtained are not in line with expectations. Students who feel they understand when the Teacher explains them, said, "*I have understood, Ma'am. However, just this*", 'I have understood, Ma'am. However, just this'. The speech is a speech about the students' apologies for the complaints that the Teacher said. So, in the conversation fragments of the teacher and students, the speech pairs contained in them are utterances of apologies.

Interlocutor of Request-Allow, Asking for Information-Giving Information, Request-Offer, Request-Acceptance/Refusal

Context: Students find the tool used for skipping too long and report it to the teacher.

Student : **Sir, why is this too long?**

Teacher : **bend it.**

Student : Like this, sir?

Teacher : **Bend on your wrist.**

In the fragment of the conversation, the students say, "*Sir, why is this too long?*" is a speech

request to the Teacher. The request statement is an indirect request for help, even though it is spoken in the form of interrogative speech. The teacher gives a response in the form of fretting in speech, "*Just bend it.*" Teacher's allowing utterances Guru has repeated once again in utterance "*Bend on your wrist.*" The second speech is also in the form of an explanation because students are still asking about it, even though it had been delivered at the first interview speech. Thus, the request-allow speech pair is in the conversation of the teacher and students in interactional discourse in high school learning.

Context: Students have different answers to Teacher's questions.

Teacher : **Have you made the label?**

Student : **Already!**

Student : **Not yet!**

Student : **I have just designed it.**

In the fragment of the conversation, Teacher's speech, "*Have you made the label?*", is a speech from Teacher's request about the labeling assignment. The speech is responded to by more than one different utterance. Speeches for giving information to students, "*Already!, Not yet!*", Moreover, "*I have just designed it,*" are responses to requests for information. Teachers can vary depending on the results of the practice of each student. Based on the research, speech pairs are requesting information-giving information in the conversation between the teacher and students in interactional learning discourse in high school.

Context: After getting the tapai sticky rice that is successfully made, the teacher moves to another group, and the other students say that the results of the practice are successful.

Teacher : **The others!**

Students : This, ma'am. It is delicious, ma'am.

The teacher's request in the conversation, "*The others!*", is a speech aimed at students who have not reported the results of the practice. Students who want to show the results of their practice offer the teacher by saying, "*Here, ma'am. It is delicious, ma'am.*" The offerings of students also have the intention that students are proud of

the results of their practice. So, the request-offer speech pairs are found in the conversation between the teacher and the students in interactional discourse in high school learning.

Context: Teacher provides opportunities for students to improve tasks.

Teacher : Listen! Is anyone still not satisfied? Please, if anyone wants to improve, you can look for those who feel confident, like this, yes. I give the score as it is. **For those who have not practiced, please practice?**

Students : **Yes, ma'am.**

Teacher's speech in the fragment of the conversation, "*For those who have not practiced, please practice?*", is spoken in the form of interrogative speeches. However, indirectly the teacher's utterance intends to ask students who have not practiced in groups to carry out practical activities, to carry out the practice seriously. The speech of teacher's request is responded with speeches received by students through speech, "*yes, ma'am.*" The students' utterances are utterances of acceptance of the expected pair of preferences in the reception statement.

In addition to the expected pairs of preferences, there are also pairs of unexpected preferences. Requests in the interactional discourse learning can be paired with rejection speeches. The request-reject request pair is in the following fragment of conversation.

Context: Students who want to taste sticky tape from the results of the demonstration task

Teacher : **Do not open it first? Open it later. Taste it later.**
Students : *taste it, Mom.*

The request statement that is told by the Teacher, "*do not need to open it first? Open it later. Taste it later. The enthusiasm later*", is an implicit speech request to students not to do the tasting first. However, the teacher's speech is rejected by the students' utterances, "*taste it, ma'am.*" The students' comments indirectly reject the Teacher's request. The refusal is a speech that is not expected in pairs of preferences with utterance requests.

Interlocutor of Assignment-Approval

Context: The teacher found sticky rice tape which is still in the form of rice because the steaming process is not according to the recipe.

Teacher : There must be something steaming. Yes, ma'am.
I think it is half-baked, right? It is half-baked, it is not steaming like this. It is still 'whole' rice, but it has been given yeast. Some, see it, it is still mawur. This is raw. Try to leave it for three days. Later, see it. Bakterinya menembuse kangelan soale mentah. Right?

Students : **Yes, Ma'am.**

Teacher assignments in the conversation "*Try to leave it for three days. Later, see it*", is a speech so that students continue to practice because the results of the practice that has been carried out have not been successful. The assignment's explanation is the continued speech of the previous complaint uttered by the Teacher. *It is half-baked, it is not steaming like this. It is still 'whole' rice, but it has been given yeast. Some, see it, it is still mawur. This is raw*". So, the teacher assignment speech is a continuation of the complaint about the practice of the students. Students respond to complaints and assignments that are told at the same time by the Teacher with a brief consent statement, "*Yes, Ma'am.*" So, the assignment-related speech pairs are in the conversation of the teacher and students in the interactional discourse in high school learning.

Interlocutor of Request-Acceptance/Refusal

Context: The teacher conveys the advantages of the steaming technique twice based on a comparison of the techniques done by the students.

Teacher : Listen. It turns out that from some recipes, it is the best. This is evaluated. From some of the best recipes, the steaming technique is twice. One steamed one, some still *nglethis*. Who has not made it? **Do you want to have remedial or the score remains as it is?**

Student : **Remedy.**

Offer speech that is spoken by the Teacher, "*Do you want to have remedial, or the score remains as it is?*" is a speech intended for students to choose remedial of tasks or assessment of the results of practices whose score is not satisfactory. Because students are offered in two activities, students

choose to accept the Teacher's offer of activities that can produce better score through speech, "Remedy." The student's speech is a speech about the acceptance of the expected partner's preferences by offering speech.

In addition to pairing with acceptance speeches, offer speeches can also be paired with rejection speeches. The following conversation breakdown contains offer-rejection speeches. The offer-rejection speech pair is in the following fragment of conversation.

Context: The teacher invites groups who have not succeeded to taste the tapai sticky rice that is successfully made.

Teacher : **Later, please. Later it will turn out to be the most delicious. All will be tasted later. However, do not give it too much, just a quarter of a spoon.**
Student : **Okay**

Teacher's speech in the fragment of the conversation, "*Later, please. Later it will turn out to be the most delicious. All will be tasted later. However, do not give it too much. Just a quarter of a spoon*", is a bidding offer for students to taste the tapai sticky rice that is successfully made. A teacher who has conditions are rejected by students indirectly through speech, "Okay." The refusal that is told indirectly by students does not have an absolute nature because in principle students can accept the offer spoken by the Teacher.

Interlocutor of Proposal Acceptance/Rejection

Context: Students ask for approval of Teacher of glutinous rice replacement for his/her duties.

Student : **Ma'am, may I change it from white sticky rice?**
Teacher : **You may.** However, if you give much yeast, then it will be *buthek-buthek*. Then it will overtake. The work is like being pushed. Put it in the basin, what's the base?
Student : Banana leaf!

Speeches of students in the conversation, "*Ma'am, may I change it from white sticky rice?*" is a proposal speech spoken by students to the Teacher. The teacher responds with acceptance or submission of proposals by saying, "*You may.*" The student's speech is the expected acceptance

speech in the preference structure with the suggestion speech.

There is also an unexpected preference structure that pairs with the acceptance speech, it is the rejection speech. The fragment of the following conversation is a proposal-reject speech paired speech.

Context: The teacher gives instructions for warm-up activities in the form of free running activities carried out by students.

Student : **Sir, can I get to the bathroom there?**
Teacher : **Just get to this line.**

Speeches of students in the conversation, "*Sir, can I get to the bathroom there?*" is a speech that intends to submit a proposal. The utterances of the proposals of the students are spoken in the form of interrogative speeches. The suggestion of the proposal is responded to by the utterances of indirect rejection by the Teacher in the speech, "*Just get to this line.*" The information uttered by the teacher has the implicit intention of rejecting the proposal of the students' proposals. Teacher's rejection is conveyed indirectly to the students' proposals as part of the rules used in warming-up activities.

Based on the research data in the form of conversation fragments in interactional discourses learning, there is acceptance speech as preferences which are expected to be paired with the proposed speech and rejection speech is an unexpected preference.

CONCLUSION

Adjacency pair in the conversation of the teacher and students in interactional discourse in high school learning includes eleven pairs; they are greetings, call-answers, complaint-help, complaint-apologies, request-allow, request-giving information, request-offer, request - acceptance, assignments-approval, offer-acceptance, and proposal-acceptance. The study of adjacency pair in this study is far from perfect. Therefore, another, more in-depth study is needed to add to the knowledge of adjacency pairs in interactional discourse learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer expressed his gratitude to Dr. Haryadi, M.Pd, who have provided suggestions, criticisms, and recommendations for improving this article. Thank you to the informants who have helped to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, Z. E., Matanggui, J. H., Yulianto, E., Nurtriputra, I., Hilaliyah, H., Wiyanti, E. (2015). *Wacana: Transaksional dan Wacana Interaksional dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pustaka Mandiri.
- Ariyanti, L. D., & Zulaeha, I. (2017). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Humanis dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran di SMA Negeri 1 Batang: Analisis Wacana Kelas. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(2), 111-122. Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/17272>
- Arum, D. P. (2015). Struktur Konversasi Wacana Debat dalam Indonesia Lawyers Club. *Jurnal Pena Indonesia*, 1(2), 188-215. Retrieved from <https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jpi/article/view/700>
- Astuti, S. P. (2018). Tegur Sapa Penjual dan Pembeli di Pasar Tradisional Surya Kusuma Semarang. *Nusa*, 13(1), 147-155. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/nusa/article/view/18334>
- Bintana, K., Rukmini, D., & Sofwan, A. (2018) The Adjacency Pairs Patterns of Trumps' Victory Interview in '60 Minutes'. *English Education Journal*, 8(1), 18-26. Retrieved from <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/22044>
- Ermawati, Yanti, Y., & Elfiondri. (2016). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs As Seen in Oprah Winfrey's Talk Show. *Abstract of Undergraduate Research, Faculty of Humanities, Bung Hatta University*, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://ejournal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php?journal=JFIB&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=6965>
- Isgiant, L. (2016). The Adjacency Pairs Analysis on 'Six Minutes English' Conversation Script of BBC Learning English: A Study of Discourse Analysis. *Proceedings. Prasasti III*, 437-441. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingprasasti/article/view/1566>
- Martyawati, A. D. (2014). Pasangan Berdampingan (Adjacency Pairs) dalam Lomba Ngapeh di Kutai Kartanegara. *Proceedings. Prasasti I*, 9-12. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingprasasti/article/view/436>
- Mudra, H. (2018). Adjacency Pairs as Uttered in The Conversations of Sofia Coppola's Lost in Translation Movie Script. *Humanus: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora*, 17(1), 126-137. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/humanus/article/view/8050>
- Permatasari, I. (2017). Adjacency Pairs in Drama Script "Teen Angel" by D.M. Larson. *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies*, 4(2), 13-20. Retrieved from <http://garuda.ristekdikti.go.id/journal/article/579535>
- Purwoko, H. (2008). *Discourse Analysis : Kajian Wacana Bagi Semua Orang*. Jakarta: Indeks.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: IKIP Press.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Darma University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan-Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Yule, G. (2014). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Yusandra, T. F. (2017). Struktur Percakapan dalam Teks Drama Anggun Nan Tongga Karya Wisran Hadi. *Jurnal Kata*, 1(2), 117-130. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.kopertis10.or.id/index.php/kata/article/view/2112>
- Zulaeha, I. (2016). *Teori, Model, dan Implementasi: Pembelajaran Menulis Kreatif*. Semarang: UNNES Press.