

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework which support the understanding of the problems formulated in Chapter 1. This chapter involves the definition of pragmatics, context, conversation analysis, turn taking, adjacency pairs, and previous related studies. I will explain deeply and comprehensively about the related theories.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a study of contextual meaning which involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said (Yule as cited in Fahrurrozi, 2015:9). Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics which studied how speakers use language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpret the meaning the speaker wishes to convey (Yule as cited in Ihsan, 2017:5). Fahrurrozi (2015:8) states that to understand people's intention, the speaker cannot only depend on the structure of language, but he should deal with the context. For instance, when a couple goes to a mall, the girl says to her boyfriend, "Look at that bag! It is beautiful, is not it?", her words can be interpreted in many ways. The hearer can interpret it as a sign that the speaker is merely praising the beauty of the bag she sees. However, it also can be interpreted as a sign that the girl wants her boyfriend to buy her that bag. Fahrurrozi (2015:8) states that the hearer also needs context or situational background to interpret a speaker's intention since an utterance can be interpreted in many ways.

Crystal defines pragmatics as the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication (Sari, 2014:9). Mey (as cited by Sari, 2014:9), pragmatics is the study of the conditions of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society. Similar to Mey's statement, pragmatics is the study of language use, that is, the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding which involves the making of inferences that will connect what is said to, what is mutually assumed, or what has been said before (Levinson as cited in Sari, 2014:9).

Based on my understanding of the definitions and concept of pragmatics as mentioned above, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between an utterance in a conversation, the context or background of the conversation, and the intention of the speaker's utterance to the

hearer in the conversation. To be able to interpret the meaning of the speaker's utterance clearly, the context cannot be ignored by the hearer.

2.2. Context

Context is not a new object of study in linguistics. The central topics of linguistic pragmatics are those aspects of meaning which are dependent on context (Cruse as cited in Sari, 2014:23). From Cruse's statement, it can be seen that context is an important concept in analyzing a conversation to be able to understand the situation and also the meaning of the speaker's utterance. Acton (2014:8) states that even determining the at-issue content of a given utterance requires consideration of context. This is because context plays a crucial role in disambiguation. Hearers who do not understand or ignore the context in a conversation will lead to misunderstandings in interpreting the meaning of an utterance. Acton gives an example about context, he states that the communicative impact of saying **damn** in a classroom is sure to be different from that saying of **damn** in a casino, despite whatever intersection in meaning the two uses would share.

Context is the words that are used with a certain word or phrase and that help to explain its meaning, or the situation in which something happens (Merriam-Webster as cited in Bajeber, 2022:7). A context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions of the world. It is these assumptions, of course, rather than the actual state of the world, that effect the interpretation of an utterance. A context in this sense is not limited to information about the immediately physical environment or the immediately preceding utterances: expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker, may all play a role in interpretation (Sperber and Wilson, as cited in Illes, 2001:17). For instance, a girl invites her friend to go out to dinner at a restaurant via WhatsApp. Then her friend says, "Sorry, I cannot come." without giving a specific reason. The girl will start to assume about the reason why her friend cannot go. It can be that her friend has no money, has the other plan, does not have a vehicle to go, or merely does not want to go. This is the point of Sperber and Wilson's statement that assumptions affect the meaning of an utterance.

From all the explanations above, it can be seen that the existence of context is necessary to find out the situation that occurs and the meaning of an utterance in a conversation. Based on my understanding, context is an important aspect in conversation to achieve success in communicating based on their types.

According to Song (2010:876-877), context is divided into three types as follows:

2.2.1. Linguistic Context

Linguistic context refers to the context within the discourse, that is, the relationship between the words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs. Take the word “bachelor” as an example. We cannot understand the exact meaning of the sentence “He is a bachelor.” without the linguistic context to make clear the exact meaning of this word. Linguistic context can be explored from three aspects: deictic, co-text, and collocation. In a language event, the participants must know where they are in space and time, and these features relate directly to the deictic context, by which we refer to the time expressions now, then, etc., the spatial expressions here, there, etc., and the person expressions I, you, etc... Deictic expressions help to establish deictic roles which derive from the fact that in normal language behavior the speaker addresses his utterance to another person and may refer to himself, to a certain place, or to a time. In 1934, Porzig argues for the recognition of the importance of syntagmatic relations, between, e.g., bite and teeth, bark and dog, blond and hair, which Firth called collocation. Collocation is not simply a matter of association of ideas. Although milk is white, we should not often say white milk, while the expression white paint is common enough (Song, 2010:876).

2.2.2. Situational Context

Situational context, or context of situation, refers to the environment, time and place, etc. in which the discourse occurs, and also the relationship between the participants. This theory is traditionally approached through the concept of register, which helps to clarify the interrelationship of language with context by handling it under three basic headings: field, tenor, and mode. Field of discourse refers to the ongoing activity. We may say field is the linguistic reflection of the purposive role of language user in the situation in which a text has occurred. Tenor refers to the kind of social relationship enacted in or by the discourse. The notion of tenor, therefore, highlights the way in which linguistic choices are affected not just by the topic or subject of communication but also by the kind of social relationship within which communication is taking place. Mode is the linguistic reflection of the relationship the language user has to medium of transmission. The principal distinction within mode is between those channels of communication that entail immediate contact and those that allow for deferred contact between participants (Song, 2010:877)

2.2.3. Cultural Context

Cultural context refers to the culture, customs and background of epoch in language communities in which the speakers participate. Language is a social phenomenon, and it is closely tied up with the social structure and value system of society. Therefore, language cannot avoid being influenced by all these factors like social role, social status, sex and age, etc. Social roles are culture-specific functions, institutionalized in a society and recognized by its members. By social status, we mean the relative social standing of the participants. Each participant in the language event must know, or make assumptions about his or her status in relation to the other, and in many situations, status will also be an important factor in the determination of who should initiate the conversation. Sex and age are often determinants of, or interact with, social status. The terms of address employed by a person of one sex speaking to an older person, may differ from those which would be employed in otherwise similar situations by people of the same sex or of the same age (Song, 2010:877).

2.3. Conversation Analysis

In discussion of discourse analysis, it is divided into text (written discourse) and talk (spoken discourse). Conversational analysis is included spoken discourse which discusses about the way language used in conversational interaction. In interacting to someone, people need to organize and manage their daily conversation (Haidar, 2017:10). In simple term, conversation can be described as an activity in which for the most part, two or more people take turn at speaking. Typically, only one person speaks at a time and tends to avoid of silence between speaking turn (Yule as cited in Haidar, 2017:10). Haidar (2017:10) states that in this case, conversational analysis is used as a guidance that aims to understand how people manage their interaction. It is not how people arrange the form of sentence or utterance itself but the way how the people manage and organize the conversation in interaction to others. Sacks and Schegloff (as cited in Rum, 2018:196) stated that people shape or design their speech unconsciously to meet the expected needs of others in the conversation.

Conversational analysis is the study of talk. To put it in slightly more complex terms, it is the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situation of human interaction; talk-in interaction (Wooffitt and Hutchby as cited in Arsy, 2011:11-12). Conversation analysis focuses on detailed recorded conversation, analyzing them for specific features of their moment-by-moment production, and interpret the significance of the utterances in the light of their environment of action (Heritage, 2006, as cited in Iswara, 2019:25). When people make a conversation, they engage in form of linguistic communication. It also involves the real context in which in the communication is made (Liddicoat as cited in Ihsan, 2017:6). In conversational

analysis, a wide range of aspect of conversation has been investigated. These include opening and closing, turn taking, adjacency pair, sequential organization, sequencing rules and coherence (Chen as cited in Arsy, 2011:11).

From all the explanation above, it can be understood that conversational analysis is a category of spoken discourse that studies how humans interact through conversation. Conversation analysis is systematic and also divided into several parts, depending on how the conversation situation occurs between human interactions. In analyzing a conversation, context is one of the important elements that will affect the meaning of an utterance.

2.3.1 Turn Taking

Sari et al. (2021:49) state that taking the turn is when someone wants to take the turn to speak. In other words, there must be only one speaker who speaks; then another one waits for the turn; it is called TRP (transition relevant places). Anggraini (2017:9) states that a start or an end of a turn depends on the context, the length of the conversation and also the way the participants perceive it. Cooperation in conversation is managed by all participants through turn-taking. Furthermore, he explains that in most cultures only one person speaks at a time, then it is continued by another. Almost all cultures have their own preferences as to how long a speaker should hold the floor and how they indicate that they have finished and another speaker can take the floor (Cutting as cited in Hidayati, 2014:19).

Sack et al. (as cited in Fathimiyah, 2016:13) state that the system of turn taking are (a) when the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right, and at the same time, is obliged to take the next turn; (b) if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the participants has the right to become the next speaker. This could be regarded as self-section; and (c) if neither the current speaker selects the next speaker nor any of the participants become the next speaker, the current speaker may resume his/her turn. In the other hand, Cook (as cited by Fathimiyah, 2016:13) states that they (the speaker and the listener) signal to each other that one turn has come to an end and another should begin. Speakers do signal when they want to end their turn at speaking and either indicates the next speaker or leave the floor open. The next speaker then continues it. This seems to be a very simple principle but despite its seeming simplicity.

In addition, pause between turns also carry particular meaning (Cook as cited in Fathimiyah, 2015:13). Fathimiyah (2016:13) explains that speakers may indicate that their turn is about to an end by ending a sentence, by pausing, and making no attempt to speak again. For example:

Lisa: I think Namjoon is the coolest man in our class.

[Pause]

Rose: Yes, I do agree with you.

Pitch can also determine turn taking. The end of a turn can be indicated by sharply raising or lowering the pitch of one's voice, or by drawling the last syllable of the final word of the turn. Other less formal cues are also used such as **you know**, **kinda**, or something (Fathimiyah, 2016:14). For example:

Shawn: Do you know that Charlie wants to buy an island?

Camila: Really?

Nonverbal cues also have a role in indicating the end of a turn. Efficient turn taking also involves factors which are not linguistics (Cook as cited in Fathimiyah 2016:14). One example of the nonverbal cues is resting one's hand as one finishes speaking. One powerful way to give a signal is to make eye contact, especially in British culture, the speaker looks away during his or her turn and looks back to the listener in his or her eye at the turn-end (Cook as cited in Kato, 2000:9).

From all the definitions mentioned above, it can be concluded that turn taking is a situation where there is a conversation between two or more people. When one participant speaks, the other participants listen and wait their turn to speak. There are several things that have an important role in turn taking, such as pauses, pitch, and nonverbal cues (resting one's hand after finishing speaking and making eye contact).

2.3.2. Adjacency Pairs

One part of conversational analysis is adjacency pairs. In Coulthard's book, there is a theory about adjacency pairs stated by Sack and Schegloff. In the book, Sacks states that the most important part in conversation is what he called adjacency pairs. In this book, he states that there are two main features of adjacency pairs: first pair parts and second pair parts (Coulthard as cited in Haidar, 2017:11). The first pair parts and the second pair parts consist of questions, answers, greetings, challenges, offers, requests, acceptances, refusals, complaints, apologies, justification, invitations, and announcements. In addition, there are other classifications of words, namely, responses, thanking, and goodbyes (Yule as cited in Haidar 2017:11). First pair parts and second pair parts in adjacency pairs are related to each other.

When the communication process takes place, there will be automatic patterns spoken by the speakers. The automatic pattern in the structure of the conversation is called adjacency pairs. Richards and Schmidt (as cited in Tampubolon, 2019:3) explain that adjacency pairs are

utterances produced by two successive speakers in such a way that the second utterance is identified as related to the first one as an expected follow up. It is line with Yule’s definition of adjacency pairs. He states that adjacency pairs contain two parts and are formed by two different speakers (Yule as cited in Tampubolon, 2019:3). From the explanation that adjacency pair is an utterance that is paired by two different speakers, the first speaker will stop talking and let the next speaker talk.

On the other hand, Levinson (as cited in Widyanti, 2017:11) mentions that alternative second pair parts of adjacency pairs are not generally equal status; rather some second turns are preferred and dispreferred. For instance, when someone invites, the second person will accept the invitation (preferred response) or refuse (dispreferred response). According to (Levinson as cited in Haidar, 2017:13) proposes the most elementary features of adjacency pairs with their rule of operation of adjacency pair. In its minimal basic form of adjacency pair is characterized by certain features. Adjacency pair are sequence of two utterances that are: (a) Adjacent: that is, one after the other; (b) Produced by different speakers; (c) Ordered as a first speaker (FPPs, or Fs for short) and a second speaker (SPPs, or Ss for short); and (d) Pair-typed: Adjacency pairs compose pair types which are exchanges such as greeting–greeting, question– answer and the like. To compose an adjacency pair, the FPP and SPP come from the same pair type.

The rule of operation that manages the use of adjacency pairs, namely: if a current speaker has produced a first part of some pair of its first possible completion, he must stop speaking, and the next speaker must produce a second part to the same pair (Levinson as cited in Haidar, 2017:14). Notes that adjacency pairs are deeply inter-related with the turn-taking system as techniques for selecting a next speaker especially where an address term is included or content of the first utterance of the pair clearly isolates a relevant next speaker (Levinson as cited in Haidar, 2017:14).

Based on my understanding, adjacency pairs are interrelated utterances in a conversation involving two or more people. After the first person stop talking, the next person will respond to the first person's speech. The second person's response depends on the first person's utterance.

Table 2.1 Type of Adjacency Pairs (Haidar, 2017)

No.	First pair part	Second pair part
1	Greeting	Greeting
2	Summons	Answer
3	Apology	Minimization

4	Question	Answer
5	Request	Acceptance/refusal
6	Offer	Acceptance/refusal
7	Blame	Admission/denial
8	Invitation	Acceptance/refusal
9	Assessment	Agreement/disagreement
10	Command	Compliance/incompliance
11	Suggestion	Acceptance/refusal
12	Assertion	Agreement/disagreement
13	Announcement	Acknowledge

The types of adjacency pairs in the table are a compilation of several sources stated by Levinson, Coulthard, and Schegloff in their book and it is possible that there are other types of adjacency pairs. There are other kinds of adjacency pairs carried out by Paltridge (as cited in Haidar, 2017:15):

a. Greeting-greeting

Greeting is the way of saying hello or to great someone (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:15).

e.g.:

A: "Hello!"

B: "Hi!"

b. Requesting-agreement

Requesting is asking someone to do something which can be responded with acceptance or refusal (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:15).

A: "Would you mind to close the window?"

B: "Of course."

c. 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 (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:15).

e.g.:

A: "What do you think about that puppy?"

B: "It is so cute."

d. 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 (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:15).

e.g.:

A: "Where do you come from?"

B: "I come from Bali."

e. Compliment-acceptance

Compliment is the way of praising another person about something he or she has. It is responded with acceptance (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:16).

e.g.:

A: "You look so beautiful in your dress."

B: "Aw, thank you."

f. Leave taking adjacency pair

The utterances which have purpose to end the conversation (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:16).

A: "Talk to you later."

B: "Great, talk to you later."

g. Complaint-apology

Complaint is utterances which indicate feeling unsatisfied about something. However, apology is the way to response the complaint, which expresses regret (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:16).

e.g.:

A: "I have been waiting for an hour and my food hasn't arrived yet."

B: "I really am sorry, Mam. Your order will be served soon."

h. Warning-acknowledgement

Warning is utterances to warn someone about something. While acknowledgement is statements which show that the warning is already acceptable (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:16).

e.g.:

A: "Beware of the wet floor."

B: "Okay, thanks."

i. Blame-denial

Blame is utterances that express that someone is responsible about the mistake. Denial is

statement to say something is not true (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:17).

e.g.:

A: “You broke the chair, did not you?”

B: “No, I did not.”

j. Threat-counter-threat,etc

Threat is utterances that indicate the intention of harm. However, counter threat is utterances that express the defeat of someone’s threat (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:17).

e.g.:

A: “You have to pay your debt, or I will report you to the police.”

B: “I will pay off my debt tomorrow.”

k. Offer-acceptance

Offer is utterances which giving something to someone, it may be in the form of goods or services. Acceptance is response indicates that the offer is accepted (Paltridge as cited in Haidar, 2017:17).

e.g.:

A: “Here is your coffee.”

B: “Thank you.”

However, this type of conversation differs from culture to culture. Just because someone can open and close conversations in their first language, does not mean that they have to know how to do it in a second language and culture (Haidar, 2017:17).

2.4. Previous Related Studies

There are three studies that I found related to my research and those will be used as references and comparisons. The first journal entitled “A Conversation Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in the Ellen DeGeneres’s Talk Show with Malala Yousafzai” is written by Tampubolon (2019). This journal focuses on conversational analysis to find the types of adjacency pairs in the conversation between Ellen DeGeneres and Malala Yousafzai on a talk show on September 9th 2015 entitled “The Incomparable Malala Yousafzai”.

The method used in this research is qualitative descriptive. The primary data of this paper were a video and script of the conversation between Ellen DeGeneres and Malala Yousafzai. The result of this research is that there are six types of adjacency pairs, they are: 1 Assessment-Agreement, 1 Compliment-Acceptance, 2 Question-Answer, 1 Opinion provide-Comment, 1

Assertion-Agreement, 1 Suggestion-Acceptance of the adjacency pairs found in “Malala Yousafzai” conversation script in Ellen DeGeneres’s talk show.

The second related study is a journal entitled “Discourse Analysis: Analysing Adjacency Pairs of Teacher and Students” is written by Rum (2018). This research employed a descriptive research method with non-participants observer. This study focuses on analyzing types of adjacency pairs and their function used by the teacher and the students in the classroom. The study shows that there are five types of Adjacency Pairs found in the teaching process. First, degreeting-degreeting pair which functions as an agreement to discontinue the certain conversation. Second, the researcher encountered a greeting-greeting pair which also a pair that has similar function as the previous pair, an agreement to discontinue the certain conversation. Furthermore, a question-refusal pair is also found in this research. It functions as questioning and refusing utterance where there is a question and then it follows with a refusal. Then, an offer-refusal pair can be found during the classroom interaction where there is an offer and the other speaker accepts the related utterance. The last pair is a question-answer pair which also occurs in this research. It functions as questioning and answering to the related remark.

Furthermore, the third related study entitled “Adjacency Pairs in the Script of Knight and Day Movie” is written by Ihsan (2017). The source of the data in this study was taken from the script of the Knight and Day movie. This research focuses on analyzing the type of adjacency pairs and dominant type of adjacency pairs found in the script of Knight and Day movie. The result of this study is that there are thirteen (13) types of Adjacency Pairs in the script of Knight and Day movie. They are greeting-greeting with amount 1 (1.5%). Summons-Answer with amount 2 (3%), apology-minimization with amount 4 (6%), question-answer with amount 19 (28.3%), request-acceptance/refusal with amount 8 (11.9%), offer-acceptance/refusal with amount 2 (3%), blame admission/denial with amount 4 (6%), invitation-acceptance/refusal with amount 1 (1.5%), assessment-agreement/disagreement with amount 6 (8.9%), command-compliance/incompliance with amount 9 (13.4%). Suggestion-acceptance/refusal with amount 1 (1.5), assertion-agreement/disagreement with amount 6 (8.9%), announcement-acknowledge with amount 4 (6%). In addition, the most dominant type of adjacency pairs in the script of Knight and Day movie was 19 question-answer with the amount of (28.3%)

Based on the previous studies above, there are several similarities and differences between the three journals and this study. The similarities that can be found from the three previous studies above with my research include: 1) analyzing patterns and types of adjacency pairs, 2) the research methods used by the three journals with this study, namely using Conversation Analysis (CA). In addition, there are differences in the three previous studies above with this

study which aims for novelty, including 1) there is a context theory to explain the speaker's utterance intention in this study which was not used in the three previous studies, 2) there are differences in research focus between the three previous studies and this study. This study focuses more on analyzing the types of adjacency pairs and the context in the conversation. So that this research can provide in-depth results regarding the types of adjacency pairs used in “Crazy Rich Asians” (2018) movie script.

