The Adjacency Pairs Patterns of Trumps' Victory Interview in '60 Minutes'

Khomsa Bintana✉, Dwi Rukmini, Ahmad Sofwan

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Article Info	Abstract
	This research is descriptive qualitative research which focuses on adjacency pairs patterns of Trumps' victory interview in '60 Minutes'. The objectives of this study are to analyze the patterns realization of adjacency pairs in the interview, to evaluate the adjacency pairs contribution of the conversation flow in the "60 Minutes", and to evaluate the pedagogical contribution. The subject of the research are Lesley Stahl, Donald Trump, Melania Trump, Donald Trump Jr, Eric Trump, Ivanka Trump, and Tiffani Trump. The writer collected the data through observation and documentation. There are two data collections that had been analyzed in this research. The data collection are the video of the interview and the transcription of the interview. The writer found some research results. First, there are six patterns of adjacency pairs found in this research. The following details are 45 data of question patterns, 17 data of assertion patterns, 7 data of request patterns, 4 data of assessment patterns, 1 data of compliment pattern, and 1 data of invitation pattern. The dominant data is the question patterns and the least data is the compliment and invitation patterns. The second is the contribution of conversation flow. Almost all the responses given by the speakers are preferred responses, so the conversation runs smoothly. Although, there are some dispreferred responses given but it does not decrease the meaning of the conversation. It gives effective contribution to the flow of the conversation. The third is this research has contribution to the theoretical and practical aspects. The theoretical contribution implicated to the theory development of linguistic especially conversation analysis and adjacency pairs. Meanwhile in practical contribution, this research can be used as reference in teaching English especially speaking.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang |

✉Correspondence Address:

Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jalan Kelud Utara III Semarang 50237, Indonesia
E-mail: Shabiina51@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Language has many branches based on its point of views. The one of language branches whose point of view is language use is pragmatics.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which learns about the use of language deals with the use of its context. The meaning of the language is understandable if the context is known. Limitations of pragmatics are the rules of the use of language form and meaning dealing with the speaker intention, the context and the circumstances. Crystal (1987: 120) stated that pragmatics studies are the factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effect of our choice on others. In theory, we can say anything we like. In practice, we follow a large number of social rules (most of them unconsciously) that constrain the way we speak.

There are five parts of pragmatics explored by Levinson (Pragmatics: 1983). Those are deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, conversational structures. Essentially, deixis concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the context of utterances or speech event, and thus also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance. Conversational implicature is a proposition or implicative statement. It is what might be interpreted, implied, or contemplated by the speakers that is different to what is actually said by the speaker in a conversation (Grice in Levinson, 1983: 97). Levinson explained presupposition as a kind of presumption or background knowledge to make an action, a theory, or an expression has a meaning. A speech act is a minimal functional unit in human communication.

Tauchid and Rukmini (2016) stated that pragmatics intend to identify the intention with which utterances are pronuounced and how they may help clarify the meaning behind some grammatical structures that do not render their transparent pragmatics force on the basis of their construction. Conversation analysis (CA) is the one of its issues.

It is an analysis of the interaction between two people or more who are involved in the conversation. According to schiffrin (1994:231), "conversational analysis is like interactional sociolinguistics in its concers with the problem of social order, and how language both creates and is created by social context.".

Conversation is the most basic form of activities undertaken by humans to establish relationships between one another. According to Fitriana and Sofwan (2017), the use of language shows peoples' relationship and attitude toward others. By conducting a conversation, people are able to express their thoughts and their feelings, and also, to exchange information to meet their needs.

CA also has implication to research related to design of language teaching tasks, materials, and assessments. As Schlegoff (2002) stated that CA research has obvious implications Language Teaching Tasks Materials of tasks and materials basedon "authentic" talk from for the design ordinary conversation and from awide real-life institutional settings in which L2 learners are professionals and as clients.

Conversation deals with communication form in some aspects and topics. It can be found in our daily life including our daily conversation with others or in formal conversation such as talk show. Since CA is used to analyze the interaction between two or more people in the conversation, the writer chose an interview between Leshley Stahl, Donald Trump, and his family in their first post-election TV interview on "60 Minutes" CBS News. The analysis focused on adjacency pairs patterns realized in the interview.

According to Levinson (1983:303), adjacency pairs are inter-related with the turn-taking system as techniques for selecting a next speaker (especially where an address term is included or the content of the first utterance of the pair clearly isolates a relevant next speaker). The term adjacency pairs is also known as preference structure. It is a relation between one

utterance and the other utterance in conversation analysis.

Two kinds of preference are preferred response and dispreferred response. Preferred response was realized when the response given by the speaker is relevant to the expectation. Dispreferred response was realized when the response given by the speaker is irrelevant to the expectation. For example, if in the first part of conversation contains a request or an offer, it is typically made in the expectation that the second part will be an acceptance. An acceptance in the second part in this case is called a preferred response. Meanwhile, a refusal in the second part is called a dispreferred response. An acceptance is structurally more likely than refusal (Yule:1996). On the other hand, if the respond in the second part is in silent way, it is indicated as refusal. Hence, it is included as a dispreferred response.

As well as Yule, Paltridge (2006) also defined the pattern of adjacency pair into first pair part and second pair part. The second pair part is the response of the first pair part and it is known as preference structures. The table below is a summary of some common adjacency pairs and typical preferred and dispreferred second pair parts. It is taken from many sourced stated by Levinson and Schegloff.

Table 1. Common adjacency pairs and typical preferred and dispreferred second pair parts

First Pair Parts	Second Pair Parts	
	Preferred	Dispreferred
Request	Acceptance	Refusal
Offer/invite	Acceptance	Refusal
Assessment	Agreement	Disagreement
Question	Expected answer	Unexpected answer or non-answer
Blame	Denial	Admission

First Pair Parts	Second Pair Parts	
	Preferred	Dispreferred
Assertion	Agreement	Disagreement
Compliment	Acceptance	Refusal

Based on the background of the study above, this study attempts to address the following research problems:
1. How are the adjacency pairs patterns realized in the "60 Minutes"?
2. How does the adjacency pairs contribute to the flow of the conversation in the "60 Minutes"?
3. How is the pedagogical contribution of this research?

The objectives of the study are to analyze the patterns realization of adjacency pairs in the interview, to evaluate the adjacency pairs contribution of the conversation flow in the "60 Minutes", and to evaluate the pedagogical contribution.

METHODS

The design of this research is qualitative research. The subjects of this study are the host "Leshley Stahl" and the guests American President Elect "Donald Trump", his wife "Melania Trump" and his children "Donald Trump Jr", "Eric Trump", "Ivanka Trump",and "Tiffany Trump". The object of this study is their conversation in the "60 Minutes".

The unit of analysis is the adjacency pairs patterns used in the conversation. The contribution of the conversation flow is evaluated after the adjacency pairs patterns have been analyzed. Then, the pedagogical contribution is also evaluated. The data is taken from conversation between Leshley Stahl, Donald Trump, and his family in the "60 Minutes". The data is videotaped and transcribed in form of utterances between speakers. By reading the transcript, I found the adjacency pairs used by the speakers and explained its intrepretation and pedagogical contribution.

In collecting the data, the researcher did some steps. Those were watching the video, transcribing the conversation, categorizing the data into instrument sheet, and observing the data into pedagogical view. The steps in analyzing the data were classifying the data into adjacency pairs patterns, interpreting the data, and interpreting the contribution.

TABLE 2. QUESTION – ANSWER

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T5. LS: How surprised were you?		✓
T6. DT: Well, I really felt we were doing well. I was on a string of about 21 straight days of speeches, sometimes many a day and the last two days I really-- I really had a pretty wild time. I did six speeches and then I did seven and-		

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The tables below are the example of some findings.

The datum above found in turn 5 and turn 6. It is the conversation between Lesley and Donald. The response found here is dispreferred response because donald did not give relevant answer based on the topic that had been asked. Lesley asked about donalds' feeling of his winning and he answered it by giving explanation about his journey and his team during election.

Table 3. Assertion

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T7. LS: But everyone thought you were going to lose.	✓	
T8. DT: I know, I did my final speech in Michigan at 1:00 in the morning and we had 31,000 people, many people outside of the arena. And I felt-- when I left, I said, "How are we gonna lose?" We set it up a day before. And we had all of these people. And it was literally at 1:00in the morning and I said, "This doesn't look like second place." So we were really happy, I mean, it was— these are great people.		

The datum above was found in turn 7 and turn 8. The response found was preferred response. In this part, Lesley said that everyone

had thought that Donald was going to lose and he agreed to that statement.

Table 4. Request

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T196. LS: Tell us about the meeting.	✓	
T197. MT: Yes, she was a gracious host. We had a great time and we talk about raising children in the White House. She was very warm and very nice.		

The datum was found in turn 196 and turn 197. The response given was preferred response. In the previous part, Lesley and Melania talked about Melanias' meeting with Michelle Obama. In this part, Lesley asked Melania to tell about the result of the meeting and she explained it.

Table 5. Assessment

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T211. LS: Sounds like you're not sure.	✓	
T212. DT: Well, sure, I'm not sure. I'd wanna see, you		

know, he may have had very good reasons for doing what he did.

The datum was found in turn 211 and turn 212. The response given was preferred response. In the previous part, Lesley and Donald talk about the FBI director James Corney and Lesley asked Donald whether he would ask the director for his resignation. In this part, Lesley told that Donalds' answer sounded like he was not sure. He agreed that he was not sure and gave the reason behind it.

Table 6. Compliment

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T1. LS: Well, congratulations, Mr. Donald.	✓	
T2. DT: Thank you.		

The datum was found in turn 1 and turn 2. The response given was preferred response. Lesley gave compliment to Donald and he said "Thank you.".

Table 7. Invitation

Utterances	Preferred Response	Dispreferred Response
T91. LS: Let's talk about your cabinet.	✓	
T92. DT: OK.		

The datum was found in turn 91 and turn 92. The response given was preferred response.

Lesley asked Donald to talk about his cabinet and he aaccept it.

There are six adjacency pairs patterns found in this research. The patterns are question, assertion, request, assessment, compliment, and invitation. The most dominant patterns is question patterns. The least data is compliment andinvitation. Meanwhile, the most dominant reponses given by the speakers is preferred responses. There are 102 preferred responses created and 38 dispreferred responses created.

The question patternsbecome dominant data because the conversation is created for an interview. The host of "60 Minutes" Lesley Stahl makes the dominant turns. Thereare 96 turns taking of question patterns. Lesleytakes part of the 95 questions and one question is taken by Donald. From 96 turns, there are 70 preferred responses and 26 dispreferred responses. It shows that there is a good relation between speakers. Lesley has an ability in digging information from the Trumps' family. Eventhough, there are some irrelevant answers given but it does not decrease the conversation essence. The dispreferred responses formed because of the interruptions made and some of them do not deign to answer it. In some turns, they look very carefully in giving the answer. Overall, the conversation is running well.

The second dominant data is assertion patterns. There are 27 turns taking of assertion patterns and there are 18 preferred responses and 9 dispreferred responses. Based on the data, it can be seen that the second spakers almost agree to the statements given. When they disagree to the statement, they give good explanation for their denial.

The next is request patterns. There are 10 turns taking of request patterns and there are 8 preferred responses and 2 dispreferred responses. Almost of them give preferred response, it means that it gives a good contribution the conversations' flow according to the expectation.

Then in assessment patterns, it is found 5 turns taking. There are 3 preferred responses and 2 dispreferred responses. As the other patterns, the dominant responses given in this patterns are also preferred responses. It shows that the second speakers agree to the assessments given. The first speaker have a good ability in conducting the conversation.

The last is compliment and invitation patterns. Each pattern has one turn taking only and all the responses is preferred response. Lesley gives compliment in the first turn. It is not like in the general opening in a conversation which usually use greeting, but the host use compliment to open the conversation. It is interesting opening because the second speaker will feel honor and it also makes him feel comfort to continue the interview. Meanwhile, the invitation pattern is used by the host to change the next topic. The way she used in changing the topic is effective so that the conversation still runs smoothly.

The responses given by the speakers give effective contribution to the flow of the conversation. The conversation runs smoothly because almost of the responses are preferred response. Although, there are some dispreferred responses given but it does not decrease the meaning of the conversation. The goal of the conversation is still reached. It can be realized because they do it in good ways. When they are interrupting, they will give the reason after that. When they are disagreeing, they will give clear explanation so that there is no missunderstanding behind them.

This research has contribution to the relevant aspects, those are theoretical and practical aspect. In theoretical aspect, it deals with the contribution to the theories, approaches, and studies about linguistic research. In practical aspect, it deals with the contribution to the english language teaching especially speaking.

The theoretical contribution implicates to the theory development of linguistic especially conversation analysis and adjacency pairs. It can be used as reference in pragmatics or semantics studies. The use of adjacency pairs pattern teaches us how to conduct good verbal communication especially in formal situation. It also helps us to analyze not only the structure of

the conversation but also the meaning behind the response.

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

CONCLUSION

This research resulted five conclusions. The first conclusion is this research contains of 75 data from 292 utterances. There are six pattern of adjacency pairs found in this research. The following details are 45 data of question pattern, 17 data of assertion pattern, 7 data of request pattern, 4 data of assessment pattern, 1 data of compliment pattern, and 1 data of invitation pattern. The dominant data is the question patterns and the least data is the compliment and invitation patterns.

The second conclusion is the frecuence of turn of each speaker. There are seven speakers in the conversation, they are the host Lesley Stahl and the Trumps family (Donald Trump, Melania Trump, Donald Trump Jr, Eric Trump, Melania Trump, and Tiffany Trump). The dominant turns is held by Lesley Stahl since she is the host of the program. She took 142 turns. Then, the second dominant turns is held by Donald Trump. He took 115 turns. Next, Melania Trump took 20 turns, Eric Trump took 7 turns, Ivanka Trump took 5 turns, Donald Trump Jr took 2 turns, and Tiffany Trump took 1 turns only. The 141 turns taken by Lesley is including to first pair parts, 1 turn taken by Donald is including to first pair part, and the rest is including to second pair parts.

The third conclusion is the response. There are two kind of responses, those are preferred response and dispreferred response. 101 preferred responses and 38 dispreferred

responses were found in this research. The details of preferred responses are; 71 data of questions-answers, 18 data of assertions, 8 data of requests, 3 data of assessments, 1 data of compliment, and 1 data of invitation. Meanwhile, the details of dispreferred responses are; 26 data of questions-answers, 9 data of assertions, 2 data of requests, and 1 data of assessment.

The fourth conclusion is the contribution of conversation flow. Almost all the responses given by the speakers are preferred responses, so the conversation runs smoothly. Although, there are some dispreferred responses given but it does not decrease the meaning of the conversation. It gives effective contribution to the flow of the conversation.

The last conclusion is this reasearch has contribution to the theoretical and practical aspects. The theoretical contribution implicated to the theory development of linguistic especially conversation analysis and adjacency pairs. Meanwhile in practical contribution, this research can be used as reference in teaching English especially speaking.

REFERENCES

Antaki, Charles. 2011. Applied Conversation Analysis Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk. UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Bou-French, Patricia. 1994. Communication Strategies and Sequences in the Conversational Discourse of Spanish Learners of English. Valencia: University of Valencia

Carnell, Janne. 2012. The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno by Janne Carnell. Ghent: Ghent University

Creswell, John.W. 2009. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.Third Edition. California: Sage Publication

Davies, Alan; Catherine Elder. 2008. The Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Dubois, S., Bostine, M., Sankoff, David. 1996. The Quantitative Analysis of Turn-Taking in Multiparticipant Conversation. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania

Eggins, S & Slade, D. 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Casel

Evnitskaya, Natalia. 2012. Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition and beyond: An Interview with Numa. P. Markee. Barcelona: Bellaterra Journals of Teaching and Learning Language and Literature Volume 5

Fischer, Kerstin. Discourse Particles, Turn-taking, and the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface. University of Hamburg

Fitriana, Ima & Sofwan, Ahmad. 2017. Politeness Strategies in Official Facebook Accounts of CNN, TWSJ, and NBC on Obama Visiting Hiroshima. Semarang: English Education Journal Volume 7 (1)

Hardwood, Christopher. 2006. Discourse Analysis: A Study of Turn-taking in a Scripted Conversation. Toronto: University of Toronto

Have, Paul ten. 2007. Doing Conversation Anlysis. London: SAGE Publication

Huctby, Ian & Wooffitt, Robin. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principle and Applications*. Cambrigde: Polity Press

Huth, Thorsten; Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm. 1999. How Can Insight from Conversation Analysis be Directly Applied to Teaching L2 Pragmatics? Sage Journals Volume 10

Jefferson, G. 1972. *Side Sequences*. New York: New York Free press

Kato, Fuyuko. 2000. Discourse Approach to Turn-Taking from the Perspektif of Tone Choice between Speakers. Birmingham: University of Birmingham

Khatimah, Khusnul. 2013. Conversation Analysis of Interview Among Oprah Winfrey, Barack Obama, and Michelle Obama in The Oprah Winfrey. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University.

Kitzinger, Celia. 1999. Just Say No? The Use of Conversation Analysis in Developing a Feminist Perspective on Sexual Refusal. Sage Journals Volume 10

Levinson, S C.1983. *Pragmatics*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. An Introduction to Conversation Analysis. London: A & C Black

Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion & Keith Morrison. 2007. Research Methods on Education, New York : Taylor & Francis e-Library

Maniruzzaman, Dr. M. 2006. *Introduction to English Language Study*. Dhaka: Friend Book corner

McHoul, Alec; Mark Raphey. 2002. How to Analyze Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods. London: A&C Black

Oyelele, Albert Laken. 2012. Interaction Management in Nigerian Television Talk Shows. Canada: International Journal of English Linguistics Volume 2

Rapley, Tim. 2008. Doing Conversation, Discourse, and Document Analysis. London: SAGE

Richards, Keith; Paul Seedhouse. 2005. Applying Conversation Analysis. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Rui, Kong; Su Ting. 2014. An Analysis of Conversation Structures in Ellen Show. Canada: Studies in Literature and Language Journals Volume 9

Sacks, H, Schegolff, E.A. and Jefferson, G.1974. "A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of turn-Taking for Conversation". USA: Linguistic Society of America

Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell

Sciffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approach to Discourse*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell

Seedhouse, Paul. 2005. Conversation Analysis and Language Learning. Cambridge: Language Teaching Journal Volume 38

Sert, Olcay & Seedhouse, Paul. *Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics*. UK: Research on Youth and Language

Sidnall, Jack. 2011. Conversation Analysis: An Introduction. Oxford: Willey-Blackwell

_____. Tanya Stivers. 2012. The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Oxford: Willey-Blackwell

Stenstrom, A. B. (1994). An Introduction to Spoken Interaction.London and New York: Longman.

Sumbayak, Desri Maria. 2010. A Conversation Analysis on an Indonesian Telephone Call. Riau: E-Journal Riau University

Tauhid, Achmad & Rukmini, Dwi. 2016. The Performance of Expressive Speech Acts as Found on Wayne Rooneys' Facebook. Semarang: English Education Journal Volume 6 (1)

Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman

Wetherell, Margaret. 1998. Positioning and Interpretative Repetoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue. Sage Journals Volume 9

Wu, Ruey Jiuan Regina. 2004. Stance in Talk: A Conversation Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles. San Diego: John Benjamin Publishing

Yao, Chen. 2011. Conversation Analysis on Mandarin TV Talk Shows by Chen Yao. Singapore: National University of Singapore

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Zou, Su. 2010. *Analysis of Fictional Conversations Based on Pragmatic Adaption*. Finland: Academy Publisher.