

# CONVERSATION ANALYSIS OF ADJACENCY PAIRS ON “ARIEL WENGROFF’S CONVERSATION WITH MALALA YOUSAFZAI”

Nurhayati<sup>1</sup>, Nur Maria<sup>2</sup>, Lilis Suryani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IKIP Siliwangi

<sup>2</sup> IKIP Siliwangi

<sup>3</sup> IKIP Siliwangi

<sup>1</sup> nurhayatiar33@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup> iianurmaria662@gmail., <sup>3</sup> suryani.lies3@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research is a study about adjacency pairs and preference organization which are uttering a conversation between Ariel Wengroff’s with Malala Yousafzai. The objectives this study are to find out kinds of adjacency pairs and preference organization on Ariel Wengroff’s conversation with Malala Yousafzai. This research is qualitative research which describes and explains the analysis by using the words. The principle information of the research is a script of interview between presenter Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai. The data were video and script which took place at the UN headquarters in New York published on April 27, 2017 and the duration was 8:36 minute. The video was transcribed into the script and discovered that there were 12 turns. At that point it was analyzed dependent on theory by Paltridge about adjacency pairs. From the data it was founded that there were 6 adjacency pairs that consisted of 2 pairs of question – answer, and 4 pair of assessment – agreement. There were also 6 preference organization that consisted of 6 preferred responses on the conversation.

**Keywords:** Analysis, Adjacency, Preference Organization

## INTRODUCTION

Conversation are the arrangement from of communication in some respects, since they permit individuals with various perspective on a topic to learn from each other. As refered to Fairlough (2001), a speech is an oral presentation by one person directed at a group. For a successful conversation, includes mutually interesting connections between the speakers or things that the speakers know. To analyze conversation interaction between two people or more the suitable theory was known as Conversation Analysis (CA). According to (Scriffin, 1994) “CA is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concern with the problem of social order, and how language both creates and is created by social context”.In CA specific consideration is given to regular spoken cooperation. As a student, the researchers also uses daily conversation interaction. For example: in the classroom, the researchers also usually uses conversation interaction with the teachers. Conversation interaction will be used when the teacher starts the class and make some games for the students. Sometimes, the teacher gives a question and the student reacts it. In this case, they are doing the conversation interaction.

The researchers analyzed the data based on theory of Paltridge (2000) to find out the conversation aspects and then specify the adjacency pairs (initiating-responding). Based on the by Paltridge, it tends to be discovered that there will be adjacency pairs existed in the conversation which contains pairs of question – answer, and other pairs of assessment – agreement / opinion providing. Then depend on the theory proposed by Paltridge (2000) it can be found that the combination of identification Question – Comply and Inform – Acknowledge.

Besides the adjacency pairs, there are several turns taken by both speakers in the conversation, the turns are taken by Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai.

In addition, Fairlough (2001) states “conversation is systematically structured, and that there is evidence of the orientation of participants to these structures in the way in which they design their own conversational turns and react to those of others.” Conversation comprise of at least two members alternating and just one members talking at any time. In most conversation, the reactions are an unconstrained response to what has recently been said. In entertainment talk shows, however, the points of discussions are regularly pre-scripted. Meanwhile, “interacting with other people is not just a mechanic process of taking turns at producing sounds and words but is rather to a semantic activity or a procedure of making meanings.” (Egins, 1997)

The term “Conversation Analysis” is to represent any study of people talking together, “oral communication”, or “language use”. (Paltridge, 2000) says that conversation analysis, ordinary conversation is the most basic form of talk and the main manner by which people come together, exchange information and maintain social relations. Most of the time, conversation consist of two, or on the other hand more members taking turns. A turns is viewed as everything one speaker says before another speaker starts to speak, and the term is called turn-taking, which is the basic form of organization for conversation.

Adjacency pairs are essential of conversation analysis that is significant for conversation openings and closings, as they are utilized in both of them. They can be characterized as paired utterances that are divided into a first pair part and a second pair part (Levinson, 1983) Richards and Schmidt as refered to (Paltridge, 2000) says that: “Adjacency pairs are utterance produced by two successive speakers in such a way that the second utterance is identified the first one as an expected follow up”. A few analysts have seen that while adjacency pairs are typical element of much regular conversation, they tend to be adjusted off by a third element in conversation of unequal power distribution.

1. Requesting – Agreement

Requesting is asking someone to accomplish something which can be responded with acceptance or refusal.

e.g.: A: “Would you mind to close the door?”

B: “Of course.”

2. Assessment – Agreement

Assessment can be formed into opinion seek or comment, which is asking another’s opinion or agreement. It is responded with agreement or called opinion provide

e.g.: A: “What do you think about that kitten?”

B: “So cute.”

3. Question – Answer

Question can be formed into information seek, clarification seek, etc. it is about asking something to someone. It is responded with information provide, clarification provide, etc.

e.g.:A: “Where do you live?”

B: “I live in London.”

4. Compliment – Acceptance

Compliment is the way of praising another about something he or she has. It is responded with acceptance.

e.g.:A: “What a nice cloth?”

B: “Oh, thanks.”

5. Greeting – Greeting

The way of saying hello and salutation.

- e.g.:A: “Hi!”  
B:”Hello!”
6. Leave taking adjacency pair  
The utterances which is have purpose to end the conversation.  
e.g.:A: “See you.”  
B: “See you.”
7. Complaint – Apology  
Complaint is utterance which indicate feeling unsatisfied about something. However, apology is the way to response the complaint, which expresses regretfulness.  
e.g.:A: “This food is too salty.”  
B: “I’m sorry, sir. I’ll give you another one.”
8. Warning – Acknowledgement  
Warning is utterance to warn someone about something. While acknowledgement is statements which show that the warning is already acceptable.  
e.g.:A: “Beware of the hole in the street.”  
B: “Okay, Thank you.”
9. Blame – Denial  
Blame is utterance that express that someone is responsible about the mistake. Denial is statement to say that something is not true.  
e.g.:A: “You lose the key, don’t you?”  
B: “No. I don’t.”
10. Threat – Counter-threat, etc.  
Threat is utterances that indicate the intension of harm. However, counter threat is utterances that express the defeat of someone’ threat.  
e.g.:A: “You got to get out of here or I’ll call the security.”  
B: “No, I won’t.”
11. Offer – Accepted  
Offer is utterance which giving something to someone, it may be in the form of goods or services. Acceptance is response indicates that the offer is accepted.  
e.g.:A: “Here is your book.”  
B: “Thanks a lot.”

Another element is the preference organization of second parts of adjacency pairs. It is firmly identified with linguistic markedness. Marked or in adjacency pairs: dispreferred expressions are structurally more muddled than unmarked or in adjacency pairs preferred ones. These complications consist in delays, prefaces like ‘well’ and accounts of why this utterances is made, (Levinson, 1983). Preference organization is a pair which gives freedom in responding to some first pair part, whether it is preferred or dispreferred one (Paltridge, 2000). There is, however, a certain amount of freedom in responding to some first pair, such as in:

A: That’s a nice shirt. (Compliment)

B: Oh thanks. (Accept)

Or

B: Actually....I don’t really like it: have it for Christmas. (Reject)

Thus, some second pair parts may be preferred and other may be dispreferred, for example: a question may be followed by an expected answer (the preferred second pair part) or an unexpected answer (the dispreferred second pair part) (Paltridge, 2000). When this happens, the dispreferred second pair part is often preceded by a delay, a preface, and/or an account, for example:

- A: are you going out with anyone at the moment? (Question)  
 B: uhhhh..... (Delay)  
 Well, kind of..... (Preface)  
 There is someone I met a while back (Account)  
 Actually I'm Getting married at the end of the year (Unexpected answer)

Levinson in Malcolm (1995: 71) observes that dispreferred second parts are distinguished by incorporating a substantial number of the following features:

1. Delay: (i) by pause before delivery; (ii) by the use of preface (see b); (iii) by displacement over a number of turns via use of repair initiators or insertion sequences.
2. Prefaces: (i) the use of makers or announcers of dispreferred like Uh and Well; (ii) the production of token agreements before disagreement; (iii) the use of appreciations if relevant (for offers, invitations, suggestion, advice); (iv) the use of apologies if relevant (for request, invitations, etc); (v) the use of qualifiers (e.g I don't know for sure, but....); (vi) hesitation in various forms, including self editing.
3. Accounts: carefully formulated explanations for why the dispreferred acts is being done.
4. Declination component: a form suited to the nature of the first part of the pair, but characteristically indirect or mitigated. Acceptance or agreement is a preferred second part to a request or an invitation because that is what we expect the other person to respond, while request rejections, refusals and disagreements are usually marked as dispreferreds that contain more complex components and allow more room for discussion.

The researchers can conclude adjacency pairs are pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent. They are considered to be an automatic sequences consisting of a first part and a second part. These parts are produced by the different participants in a conversation. Preference organization is second pair part who are free to give answer, the answer divided into two parts preferred response and dispreferred response. Preferred response is acceptance the first pair part, and dispreferred response is refusal the first pair part.

## METHOD

This research used qualitative descriptive method as a research type. Qualitative method is a study, in which the researchers does not set out test hypothesis, but rather to observe what is present with their focus, and consequently is used in the literal sense of describing situations or events (Isaac, 1987). By using the qualitative descriptive method, this study is intended to find and describe aspects of conversation within the conversation between Presenter Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai. The unit of analysis of this research is the turn in utterances produced by the speakers in the conversation. The speakers are the presenter Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai. The data which contains video and script which take place at the UN headquarters in New York published on April 27, 2017 and the duration is 8:36 minute. This video was watching on YouTube <https://youtu.be/15p19KVH47s> channel YouTube Broadly. Techniques of data collection first, finding the website for the data on the internet. The researchers searched on the internet from website that provided the script of the interview. Second, downloading the data interview between Presenter Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai from platform id.savefrom.net third, watching the video of the data. The researchers took some time to watch the video of the interview to matching each word the script of data and the video. After reading the script of the dialogue, some steps were conducted to analyze the data. First, reading the script. The researchers reads the script of the interview. Second, classifying the data according to the conversation interaction aspects there are Adjacency pairs, and Preference Organization using the theory from Paltridge. The last drawing conclusion.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

The researchers analyzed the data by using the theory of adjacency pair by Paltridge to categorize the data as generally. There were three kinds of adjacency pairs in the data

#### 1. Adjacency Pairs

##### 1.1 Question – answer (Information Provide or Clarification Provide)

In the data here, either the interviewer or the interviewee did the confirmation to make sure that his assumption was true. Furthermore, the addressee, who responded to this question, gave an answer, information or clarification that was the answer to the question.

**Table 1. Example of Adjacency Pair Question – Answer**

Turn	Time	Speakers	Utterances	Pairs	
				First Part	Second Part
1	1:29	A	“Malala thank you for taking the time to speak with us today, you’re starting your Girl Power Tour, so can you tell me a little bit about <b>what that trip this is, and what you’re hoping to accomplish?</b> ”	Question	
2	1:39	M	“ <b>So through the Girl Power Tour I’m hoping to visit different parts of world, where there’s like Latin America or Middle East and I want to make sure that I find the incredible girl who can bring change in their communities, I want to encourage them and that I was also just like them living in a small valley and when my life were taken away I spoke out so it is better and now that when something wrong is happening in their community they need to speak out and integrate their voices, so I’m really excited for that and I’m hoping that we would find advocate or find champion inspiring those who can bring change in their community.</b> ”		Answer (Information Provide)

From the data above, it can be seen that the interviewee tried to answer about Girl Power Tour and what she want about the tour to the interviewer. The interviewee was not only giving direct answer, but also the interviewee gave another information which was the answer expected from the question asked by the interviewer.

1.2. Assessment – Agreement/Disagreement

The speaker expressed his feeling, judgement or evaluation about certain events, people or object. Moreover, the response to his combination was an agreement, stating that the addressee agreed or disagreed to what the speaker’s opinion.

**Table 2. Example of Adjacency Pair Assessment – Agreement**

			Speakers	Pairs
Turn	Time		Utterances	First Part      Second Part
11	7:07	A	“From your personal experience <b>do you think the United States can be helpful in areas like health care and education and conflicts like Pakistan and Syria?</b> ”	<b>Assessment</b>
12	7:14	M	“ <b>I think the United States can say a big horn in bringing world peace</b> , if the US decides to and in that it is important that they have investment in education especially because in Pakistan, Iran opened many of the countries we have seen US intervention, before but that is in the form of world and now winning investment. I think that is how countries can go forward and if there is terrorism in one country then that is not limited to that one country then it affects the whole world so it should be taken as well as a global, cause education health and helping to improve the standards of living of all people should be become a global cause we should not have division we should consider each other as brother and sister and try to help each other because health in one community would help the whole world it would bring better liver to all of us and then it also think that we should not just fully be dependent on the us or other countries also must stand together in unite for investing in the regions which support and help is needed for the deprived people in communities.”	<b>Agreement</b>

From the data above, it can be seen that the interviewer made an assessment to the interviewee by saying “from your personal experience do you think the United States can be helpful in areas like health care and education and conflicts like Pakistan and Syria?” The interviewer was

asking the interviewee’s assessment about United States can be helpful in conflict areas. The interviewee gave a agreement to the interviewer by saying “I think the United States can say a big horn in bringing world peace”

**Table 3. Kind of Adjacency Pair**

No	Kind of Adjacency Pair	Σ	%
1.	Question – Answer	2	33
2.	Assessment - Agreement	4	67
<b>Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>

From the table 3 above, it could be seen that there were two kinds of adjacency pairs of conversation occurred in the data. It result that combination of question – answer had 2 pairs, and assessment – agreement had 4 pairs. The researchers found many assessment – agreement in this conversation because the interviewer want to know the interviewee’s assessment about the issues.

2. Preference Organization

Preference organization is a pair which give freedom in responding to some first pair parts, whether is preferred or dispreferred. Preference organization not only become one of the important things when the speaker wants to agree or disagree what are the speaker opinions, but also makes both of the speakers can organize what will they say if accept or refuse a question.

2.1 Question-Answer

**Table 4. Example of Preference Organization Question - Answer**

Speakers			Pairs	
Tu rn	Tim e	Utterances	First Part	Second Part
9	5:54	A “What do you think the United States should do in a situation like Syria?”	Question	
10	5:57	M “I think in the United States there should be very clever people who are solving and who are governing the whole country that’s what you would expect and I hope there are people who would understand the short term restarts I’m the long run effect and I think it’s important that in Syria they try to understand the real – life situation of people I have been to refugee camps and I have maximize and refugee children. I know what life is like living in a tent and when you talk to these young girls in children the dreams is to go back to their country to see peace they way they have the same dreams with us, they want to become doctors, teachers, engineers. You meet their parents they had also been teachers there have been engineers, they’re		Expected Answer

just people like us, and the United States they need to realized Salaam and you choose more but then on the other hard you don't welcome with innocent people who are affected the must so in that case I'll say like welcoming refugees it's the most important thing to do, to welcome them we need to support the netting millions and if people ignore them we will lose a generations."

From the data above, it can be seen that A as an interviewer giving an assessment by saying "What do you think the United States should do in a situation like Syria?" to M as an interviewee and M gave an expected answer by saying "I think in the United States there should be very clever people who are solving and who are governing the whole country" M was giving expected answer by answering the question according to what was asked.

2.2 Assessment-Agreement

**Table 5. Example of Preference Organization Assessment - Agreement**

Tu rn	Time	Speakers	Utterances	Pairs	
				First Part	Second Part
7	4:54	A	<b>"As he or anyone from his administration reached out to you to try and hear your thoughts and if you did would you take the meeting?"</b>	Assessment	
8	5:07	M	<b>"What if an opportunity comes to me them I would definitely meet him</b> and I think we need to keep in mind that I would be staking out for girls and I don't hesitate in saying what I feel and when I go to such meetings I just imagine for a second that it's not me, it's for hundreds and thousands of girls I have matching the refugee games and speaking loud. I think the most important thing for president is to understand what a life is like when you are refuge when you are living in these camps and I think you should go and visit these refugee camps and see the real-life situations, when you don't have any hope when you don't have access to and so you don't have a luxury life that is better than your life of refugee people and once you see that then you will realize why these people need save a better area to live in."		Agreement



From the data above, it can be seen that A as an interviewer gave a question “if you did would you take the meeting?” to M as an interviewee and M answer a question from A with “I would definitely meet him” M gave preferred respond by agreeing an assessment from A.

**Table 6. Preference Organization**

No.	First Part	Second Part	Σ
1.	Question	Expected Answer	2
		Unexpected Answer	
2.	Assessment	Agreement	4
		Disagreement	
Total			6

From the table 6 above, it could be seen the researchers found 2 question – expected answer and 4 assessment – agreement. Ariel Wengroff as interviewer giving question and assessment to Malala Youzafsai as interviewee and Malala Youzafsai giving expected answer and agreement according to what was asked.

**Discussion**

By using theory by that: “Adjacency pairs are utterance produced by two successive speakers in such a way that the second utterance is identified the first one as an expected follow up”. The researchers found two kinds of adjacency pairs in the data which was consisted of combination of question – answer pair, and assessment – agreement pair. There were 2 pairs of question – answer, 4 pairs of assessment – agreement. By using theory “a question may be followed by an expected answer (the preferred second pair part) or an unexpected answer (the dispreferred second pair part)” Paltridge (2006: 117) the researcher also found the preference organization on the conversation that divided into two parts; preferred respond and dispreferred respond. There were 6 preferred respond which were consisted of 2 pair of question – answer, 4 pairs of assessment – agreement.

**CONCLUSION**

The researchers concludes that from the analysis, there were 2 kinds of adjacency pairs and 6 preferred organization from the conversation between Ariel Wengroff and Malala Yousafzai. It was found that there were two combinations of common adjacency pair by Paltridge. There were combinations of question – answer had 2 pairs, and assessment – agreement had 4 pairs. Based on theory by Paltrige, the researchers found 6 preference organizations in the data. Researcher described the types of preference organization into two parts; those are preferred respond and dispreferred respond. The result are the researchers found 6 preferred responds which were consisted of question – answer 2 pairs, A as interviewer gave a question to M as the interviewee and M was giving preferred respond by answering the question according to what was asked. Assessment – agreement 4 pairs, A as an interviewer giving many assessment to M as an interviewee and M was giving agreement.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Thanks to Allah SWT, which has provided health. The researchers would like to express very great appreciation to Mrs. Lilis Suryani, M.Pd., as our supervisor, the researchers parents and

family who has been encouraging to complete this study, all lecturer English Education Study program, and our university IKIP Siliwangi, thank you so much to being a part of my life.

## REFERENCES

- Eggin, S & Slade. D. 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Casel.
- Fairlough, Norman. 2001. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W.B. 1987. *Handbook in Research and Evaluation*. San Diego, CA: Edits Publishers.
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6, Conversation Structure.
- Paltridge, B. 2000 *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Queensland: antidopedean Educational Enterprises.
- Scriffin, Deborah. 1994. *Approach to Discourse*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.