

Adjacency Pairs and Implicature of Utterances by President Joko Widodo in the Episode of *Di Balik Dinding Istana* of the *Mata Najwa* TV Program

Tri Wiratno

Faculty of Humanities
Sebelas Maret University Surakarta
Surakarta, Indonesia
wiratno.tri@gmail.com

Sumarlam

Linguistics Doctoral Program
Postgraduate of Sebelas Maret University Surakarta
Surakarta, Indonesia
sumarlamwd@gmail.com

Ratna Susanti

Linguistics Doctoral Program
Postgraduate of Sebelas Maret University Surakarta
Surakarta, Indonesia
ratnasusanti19@yahoo.co.id

Abstract—A conversation made by two people is known as dialogue. It is structured by means of adjacency pairs that may be analyzed under the umbrella of pragmatics (Yule, 2006). This study was aimed at: (1) identifying the structure of adjacency pairs in the dialogue between President Joko Widodo and Najwa Shihab and (2) identifying the implicatures of adjacency pairs in the dialogue. It was a qualitative type of research applying a pragmatic approach. The data were obtained from the transcript of the dialogue between Najwa Shihab and President Joko Widodo in the *Mata Najwa* episode of "Di Balik Dinding Istana" (Beyond the Palace Walls) broadcasted by Metro-TV. The structures of the adjacency pairs found in the dialogue are 18 structures, namely (1) question-answer, (2) question-refusal, (3) question-question, (4) question-divert, (5) question-reason, (6) question-affirmation, (7) question-nonverbal doing with reason, (8) question-agreement, (9) question-conclusion, (10) question-wish, (11) confirm-refusal, (12) confirm-nonverbal doing with interpretation, (13) confirms-nonverbal doing, (14) confirms-agreement, (15) thanks-acceptance, (16) nonverbal doing-explain, (17) thanks-nonverbal doing, and (18) acknowledgment-acceptance.

Keywords—*adjacency pairs; implicature; dialogue; pragmatics*

I. INTRODUCTION

People communicate verbally with each other through a conversation in order to convey the intended message. A conversation involves two or more participants using natural and spontaneous forms of language to communicate ideas and information as parts of social life. As a process of sending and receiving information, conversation is an essential element of most events of communication. The conversation itself should take place in a situation where a speaker and a hearer occupy their own functions and tasks (Baiat et al, 2013; Hagoort & Meyer, 2013). A speaker, as the name implies, is the doer of a conversational event whose task is to send information to the hearer. The hearer is one who receives the information sent by the speaker.

There are two kinds of communication, namely direct and indirect communications. The first is a face-to-face communication, whereas the second is a communication that occurs by means of a medium to transform ideas and messages. As already known, one form of communication is conversation. In a conversation, sometimes the utterance that is spoken has a direct or indirect meaning.

In producing utterances, a speaker should meet the rules of conversation so that the intended message is easily understood by both the speaker and the listener. However, in practice, they sometimes violate the rules intentionally or unintentionally. This results in a kind of implicature or implicit use of language (Mey in Nugraheni, 2011, p. 184). To understand more about the implied or intended meaning in utterances, an implicature theory is required, as put forward by Grice in his article entitled "Logic and conversion" (1975).

Conversational implicature is part of a pragmatic study that specializes in the analysis of implicit meanings. Levinson (1983; See Nadar, 2009) even suggests that implicature is one of the most important ideas in pragmatic. The position of implicature in the study of language modesty is parasitic. Excessive implicature intent can offend the partner. The implicitness of the purpose implied by the implicature causes unlimited intentions that should be captured by the said counterpart.

The statement is strengthened by Katalin (in Prayitno, 2011, p. 120) implicature plays a role in communication. Thus, it is appropriate that the use of strategy in acts of politeness can save implicature. The same is expressed by Cummings (2007, p. 16) conversational implicature can be motivated by politeness. Based on that thought, the author will also identify the form of language politeness strategy.

In a conversation, the speaker and the hearer take turns during the exchange of conversation, but the implied responses can be diverse and even unexpected. Every conversation has a systematic pattern that can be predicted although sometimes not easily. This is known as adjacency

pair. Schegloff (2007, p. 3) states that adjacency pair is a sequential shift from the speaker to his or her partner. The conversation consists of a regular sequence as spoken by the speaker and the partner. Such sequences are expected to be interrelated.

In everyday life, positive politeness has been widely applied, among others in the field of politics. Positive politeness is especially used to create a good image. Imaging is considered very important in politics. Image formation by politicians is the most powerful reason for the application of positive politeness. This imagery is related to the public's judgment and acceptance of political figures. One figure who has a good image in politics is President Joko Widodo. The public have considered that President Joko Widodo has a polite personality, as reflected in his behavior and speech acts. Many members of the public assume that President Joko Widodo is not a linguist, but can adopt an excellent strategy of speech.

One of the most influential media making the popularity of President Joko Widodo widespread is television. Jokowi often appears in various news on television. Not only in news events, but also in talk shows. The talk show that has even invited Jokowi several times is *Mata Najwa* program, which is a spectacle worth taking into account. This is because *Mata Najwa* contains a high educational value. Many political figures and elites were invited to the this talk show.

Based on the above background, the researchers focused the research on adjacency pairs and implicature in the dialogue between President Joko Widodo and Najwa Shihab broadcast on Metro-TV.

II. METHOD

This study was devoted to the dialogue between President Joko Widodo and Najwa Shihab as the host of the *Mata Najwa* program on Metro TV. The analysis was focused on the identification of (1) the patterns of adjacency pairs between President Joko Widodo and Najwa Shihab and (2) the form of conversation implicature of the program. The researchers qualitatively collected the data (Sutopo, 2006) by watching the *Mata Najwa* program on Metro-TV, then continuing to listen to the recording of the dialogue from Youtube, transcribing it, and classifying the types of adjacency pairs found. By applying a pragmatic approach, the researchers analyzed the data through giving marks to each utterance in the transcription of the dialogue so as to decide the patterns of adjacency pairs alongside their implicature.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

There are 78 adjacency pairs found in the transcription of the dialogue between President Joko Widodo and Najwa Shihab. As can seen in Table 1, the highest adjacency pairs produced by the speaker (Najwa Shihab) responded by the hearer (President Joko Widodo) are Question-Affirmation, amounting to 15 (19.23%). Second, the adjacency pairs of Question-Reason are as many as 12 (15.38%). Third, two adjacency pairs, namely Question-Answer and Confirmation-Agreement, amount to 8 (10.25%) respectively. Fourth, there are 7 adjacency pairs of Confirmation-Nonverbal doing followed by explanation (8.97%). Fifth, adjacency pairs of

Question-Divert and Question-Agreement amount to 5 (6.41%) each. Sixth, adjacency pairs of both Question-Refusal and Question-Conclusion amount to 3 (3.87%). Next, adjacency pairs of Question-Nonverbal doing and reason, Question-Wish, and Confirmation-Refusal amount to 2 (2.56%) each. Finally, there are 6 adjacency pairs appearing only once (1.28%), namely Question-Question, Confirmation-Nonverbal doing, Thank-Acceptance, Nonverbal doing-Explanation, Thank-Nonverbal doing, and Acknowledgment-Acceptance.

The utterances initiated by the speaker get responses from the hearer. Seen from how the utterances are initiated and how they are responded, the structures of adjacency pairs found in this study can be formulated. The utterances and responses in the adjacency pairs can be categorized into preferred and dispreferred as well.

TABLE I. FREQUENCY OF ADJACENCY PAIRS

No.	Structure of Adjacency Pairs	Number	Percentage
1.	Question-Answer	8	10,25%
2.	Question-Refusal	3	3,87%
3.	Question-Question	1	1,28%
4.	Question-Divert	5	6,41%
5	Question-Reason	12	15,38%
6.	Question-Affirmation	15	19,23%
7.	Question-Nonverbal doing and reason	2	2,56%
8.	Question-Agreement	5	6,41%
9.	Question-Conclusion	3	3,87%
10.	Question-Wish	2	2,56%
11.	Confirmation-Refusal	2	2,56%
12.	Confirmation-Nonverbal doing and explanation	7	8,97%
13.	Confirmation-nonverbal doing	1	1,28%
14.	Confirmation-Agreement	8	10,25%
15	Thank-Acceptation	1	1,28%
16	Nonverbal doing-Explanation	1	1,28%
17	Thank-nonverbal doing	1	1,28%
18	Acknowledgement-Acceptation	1	1,28%
Number		78	100%

It can be calculated from Table 2 that the dialogue between Najwa Shihab (as the speaker) and President Joko Widodo (as the hearer) comprises 18 structures of adjacency pairs, 11 of which belong to the preferred (61.2%) and 7 others belong to dispreferred ones (38.8%). It can also be observed that every utterance from the speaker gets different responses from the hearer. The variations of the responses given by the hearer depend very much on the context. This is the factor causing the hearer's responses to be preferred or dispreferred by the speaker.

The responses of the hearer that the speaker likes are when the speaker asks a question to the hearer and the hearer answers to it according to the speaker's expectation. The first four examples in below fall into the category of preferred adjacency pairs. The other two examples that follow fall into the dispreferred ones.

A. Question-Answer

Najwa Shihab: (question)

"Satu tahun memimpin negeri. Waktu satu tahun ini terasa cepat atau lambat, Pak?"

"One year leading the country. This one year's time is felt fast or late, Sir?"

President Joko Widodo: (answer)

*"Sangat cepat sekali."
"Very fast."*

Context:

Najwa Shihab's utterance is a question form directly answered by President Joko Widodo relevant to the question, although the existence of word 'very' seems to be a wastage or an ineffectiveness.

TABLE 2. THE LIST OF PREFERRED AND DISPREFERRED ADJACENCY PAIRS

Type of Adjacency Pairs	Structure of Preferred	
	Utterance	Response
Preferred Adjacency pairs	question	answer
	question	affirmation
	question	agreement
	question	conclusion
	question	wish
	confirmation	explanation
	confirmation	agreement
	thank	acceptance
	nonverbal doing	explanation
	thank	nonverbal doing
	acknowledgement	acceptance
Dispreferred Adjacency Pairs	Structure of Dispreferred	
	Utterance	Response
	question	refusal
	question	question
	question	divert
	question	reason
	question	nonverbal doing and reason
	confirmation	refusal
confirmation	nonverbal doing	

B. Question-Confirmation

Najwa Shihab: (question)

"Sudah merasa seperti rumah belum, Pak Jokowi? Feel at home?"

"Do you feel at home, Mr. Jokowi?"

President Joko Widodo: (confirmation)

"Sudah...sudah...sudah...sudah."

"Already...already...already...already."

Context:

Najwa Shihab asks President Joko Widodo about his feelings related to Joko Widodo's decision to stay at the Bogor Palace. The answer by President Joko Widodo is an answer in the form of an affirmation for repeating the answer four times, as the answer to Najwa Shihab's question.

C. Question-Agreement

Najwa Shihab: (question)

"Merasa diburu-buru waktu, begitu?"

"Feeling rushed in time, right?"

President Joko Widodo: (agreement)

"Ya memang kita selalu merasa harus seperti itu karena masalahnya banyak, karena masalahnya banyak, karena kita dibatasi waktu."

"Yes, indeed we always feel like that because the problem is a lot and we have limited time."

Context:

When interviewed by Najwa Shihab, Joko Widodo as President of Indonesia for one year of his leadership, he felt very fast as time passed. Because many problems in Indonesia during the time required a fast and well-defined approach. Therefore, President Joko Widodo felt like being pushed to immediately solve various problems concerning the interests of the Indonesian people.

D. Acknowledgement-Acceptance

Najwa Shihab: (acknowledgement)

"Sudah setahun, selamat bekerja untuk pekerjaan selanjutnya. Terima kasih, Pak."

"It's been a year, good work for the next job. Thank you, Sir."

President Joko Widodo: (acceptance)

"Terima kasih."

"Thank you."

Context:

While closing the dialogue at the *Mata Najwa* talk show, Najwa Shihab conveyed a statement to President Joko Widodo for his one-year presidential performance and encouraged him to complete his presidential responsibilities for subsequent years during his leadership period. Najwa Shihab also expressed his gratitude for President Joko Widodo's willingness to be interviewed as a guest star in the *Mata Najwa* on Metro-TV.

On the other hand, there are some counter responses from the hearer that the speaker disprefers. In the following examples, questions raised as confirmations by the speaker is refused or diverted by the hearer. These examples definitely fall into the category of dispreferred adjacency pairs.

A. Question-Refusal

Najwa Shihab: (question)

"Yang beli Bapak sendiri ya wortelnya?"

"Who buys carrot? Yourself?"

President Joko Widodo: (refusal)

"Ya...tapi yang sering anak saya. Yang jelas, istana kan sekarang kita maunya itu kan pintunya dibuka untuk umum."

"Yes ... but that is often by my child. Actually, the palace right now is opened to the public."

Context:

The activity of President Joko Widodo in the morning at Bogor Palace is to feed the carrots to the deer in the courtyard of the palace. Before feeding the deer, President Joko Widodo cycled with one of his children around the Bogor Palace or headed for a market near the palace buying vegetable carrots to give to the deer. President Joko Widodo said that it is not he who often buys carrots from vegetable sellers in the nearby market, but his son.

B. Question-Divert

Najwa Shihab: (question)

"Kalau di Istana Jakarta terlalu berisik begitu, Pak? Terlalu banyak kepentingan?"

"Inside the Palace of Jakarta is too noisy, Sir? Too many interests?"

President Joko Widodo: (divert and nonverbal doing)

"Ya karena kan di luar istana itu kan kendaraan banyak sekali. Jadi, berisiknya berisik kendaraan, hehehe...."

"Yes because outside the Jakarta Palace are a lot of vehicles. So, the noisy noise of vehicles, hehehe...."

Context:

President Joko Widodo's decision to stay more often in Bogor Palace prompted Najwa Shihab as a presenter to ask more questions about the reason for the decision. Initially, Najwa Shihab provoked a question to President Joko Widodo that in Jakarta it is too noisy and the real intention of Najwa Shihab is actually related to President Joko Widodo's political opponents. However, in order to keep the political situation and condition in Indonesia remain peaceful and calm, President Joko Widodo diverted the answer to Najwa Shihab's question by replying that outside the Jakarta Palace are too full of vehicles.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study can be concluded as follows. First, Joko Widodo is one of the figures who has a good image in politics. Indonesian people believe that President Joko Widodo has a polite personality, seen from both behavior and speech acts. He is not a linguist but he can apply a very good strategy to speak. Second, the *Mata Najwa* talk show has 18 structures of adjacency pairs, eleven of which fall into preferred adjacency pairs and the rest fall into dispreferred adjacency pairs. The structures of the dispreferred adjacency pairs indicate the strategy of President Joko Widodo to answer the Najwa Shihab's questions with respect to the political situations in Indonesia expected to be safe, calm, stable, and comfort, so as not to make Indonesian people provoked and divided.

Acknowledgment

This article is one of the outputs of the second year research grant for 2018, under the title Pragmatic Practice of Literacy between Presenters and Guest Stars of Political Leaders. The research team would like to thank to Kemenristekdikti through LPPM Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta who has funded this research.

References

Baiat, G.E., Coler, M., Pullen, M., Tienkouw, S., & Hunyadi, L. (2013). Multimodal analysis of "well" as a discourse marker in conversation: A pilot study. *The 4th IEEE*

- International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications*, Budapest, Hungary.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1978). *Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena*. In E.N. Goody (Eds.), *Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cumings, L. (2007). *Pragmatik sebuah perspektif multidisipliner* (Translated by E. Setiawati). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Fetzer, A. (2014). *Conceptualising discourse*. In K.P. Schneider, & A. Barron (Eds.), *Pragmatics of discourse*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 35-62.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole, & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-45.
- Hagoort, P., & Meyer, A. S. (2013). What belongs together goes together: The speaker-hearer perspective: a commentary on Macdonald's PDC account. *Frontiers in Psychology*, <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00228>
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahsun. (2005). *Metode penelitian bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Raya Grafindo Persada.
- Mudra, H. (2018). Adjacency pairs as uttered in the conversations of Sofia Coppala's lost in translation movie script. *Journal of Humanis*, (17)1, 126-137.
- Nadar, F. (2009). *Pragmatik dan penulisan pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Nugraheni, Y. (2011). Implikatur percakapan tokoh wanita dan tokoh laki-laki dalam film "Harry Potter and The Goblet of Fire". *Lensa*, 1(2), 183-193. <http://jurnal.unimus.ac.id>.
- Pomerantz, A., & Pehr. B.J. (2000). *Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Prayitno, H.J. (2011). *Kesantunan sosiopragmatik (Studi pemakaian tindak tutur direktif di kalangan andik SD berbudaya Jawa)*. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A., & Lerner, G.H. (2009). Beginning to respond: Well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research On Language and Social Interaction*, 42(2), 91-115.
- Sutopo, H.B. (2006). *Penelitian kualitatif: Dasar, teori, dan penerapannya dalam penelitian*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.