

**ADJACENCY PAIRS AND POLITENESS STRATEGY IN ORDINARY  
CONVERSATION: A STUDY AT FKIP MATARAM UNIVERSITY**



**PUBLICATION JOURNAL**

Presented as the Partial Fullfillment of the Requirements of the Bachelor Degree  
in English Education Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
University of Mataram

**By:**

**NADIFA**

**E1D014035**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION UNIVERSITY OF  
MATARAM  
2018**



**KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI, DAN PENDIDIKAN  
TINGGI UNIVERSITAS MATARAM  
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN  
Jl. Majapahit 62 Mataram NTB 83125  
Telp: (0370) 623873**

---

**JOURNAL APPROVAL**

A Thesis Entitled:

**ADJACENCY PAIRS AND POLITENESS STRATEGY IN ORDINARY CONVERSATION:**

**A STUDY AT FKIP MATARAM UNIVERSITY**

by:

**NADIFA**

**(E1D014004)**

Has been approved in Mataram on      Nov 2018, by:

**First Consultant,**

**Prof. Drs. Mahyuni, MA, Ph.D.**  
**NIP. 19631231198803 1 024**

**ABSTRACT**  
**ADJACENCY PAIRS AND POLITENESS STRATEGY IN ORDINARY**  
**CONVERSATION: A STUDY AT FKIP MATARAM UNIVERSITY**

Nadifa

E1D014035

[nadifabagis28@gmail.com](mailto:nadifabagis28@gmail.com)

The aim of this study is to find out the use of adjacency pairs and politeness strategy between student-student and student-teacher. The researcher discusses the occurrences and the factors that may influence the lack of adjacency pairs and the implementation of politeness strategy in ordinary conversation. The scope of this study are student-student and student-teacher at FKIP Mataram University. In the data collection, the data was gathered by recording and note-taking from the conversation around FKIP Mataram University which used Bahasa. The result shows the types of adjacency pairs that were occurred at FKIP Mataram University were question-answer, request-acceptance, greeting-greeting and inform-acknowledge. The factors that make people fail to implement adjacency pairs were setting, social status and role, and gender (sex). Indonesian culture considers a social status to shows their attitude. Therefore, politeness strategy between student-student mostly used bald-on record politeness and positive politeness. Meanwhile, the conversation between student and teacher was occurred by using negative politeness and off-record politeness.

**Key words:** *Adjacency Pairs, Politeness, Strategy, Politeness Strategy, Speech Act.*

**ABSTRAK**  
**PASANGAN BERDAMPINGAN DAN STRATEGI KESANTUNAN DALAM**  
**PERCAKAPAN SEHARI-HARI: PENELITIAN DI FKIP UNIVERSITAS**  
**MATARAM**

Nadifa

E1D014035

[nadifabagis28@gmail.com](mailto:nadifabagis28@gmail.com)

Tujuan Penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan penggunaan pasangan berdampingan dan strategi kesantunan di antara mahasiswa-mahasiswa dan mahasiswa-dosen. Peneliti mendiskusikan tentang kejadian dan factor yang mungkin mempengaruhi kegagalan pasangan berdampingan dan pengimplementasian strategi kesantunan dalam percakapan sehari-hari. Ruang lingkup dalam penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa-mahasiswa dan mahasiswa-dosen di FKIP Universitas Mataram. Pada pengumpulan data, data dikumpulkan dengan merekam dan mencatat percakapan yang menggunakan Bahasa Indonesia disekitar FKIP Universitas Mataram. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan pasangan berdampingan yang terjadi di FKIP Mataram University adalah tanya- jawab, meminta-menerima, memberi salam-memberi salam kembali, informasi-tanggapan. Faktor yang membuat orang gagal untuk mengimplementasikan pasangan berdampingan adalah setting, status sosial dan role, dan gender. Budaya Indonesia mempertimbangkan status sosial untuk menunjukkan etikanya. Oleh karena itu, strategi kesantunan antara mahasiswa-mahasiswa paling bnyak menggunakan kesantunan bald-on record dan kesantunan positif . Sedangkan, percakapan antara mahasiswa dan dosen terjadi dengan menggunakan kesantunan negative dan kesantunan off-record.

*Kata Kunci: Pasangan berdampingan, kesantunan, strategi, strategi kesantunan, tindak tutur.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Humans as social being meet each other in every day and do something called communication. Communication is an act by which one person gives to or receives from another person information about that person's needs. At the time that people engage in conversation, it seems like they take their turns spontaneously depend on the topic they were discussing. Actually, conversation deal with some rule that makes people can take their turn partly. For example, when someone invites at least the other accept or deny. Linguist called this the adjacency pairs. Adjacency pairs are one of the spoken languages that the pattern manage how to react to some expression (e.g. greeting-greeting). To communicate well we should consider the pattern of speech such as the adjacency pairs form.

Besides the adjacency pairs, in interaction, to avoid a conflict, people have to take into account the politeness strategy. Politeness is aimed to show one's respect for others. Humans are different, for example, different gender, different status, and also a different culture. The individual should consider social and culture when they use a language in conversation. Although one thinks that some language is polite may it will be extremely impolite for another one. In some culture, there is a social status that makes you decide your attitudes in speech such as age, position (ex: teacher) and etc. For those reasons, being polite is a remarkable matter in any language.

The researcher is just curious about how people in FKIP Mataram university pay attention to the sequences of conversation while they are communicating with each other. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the factors that may break the consistency of adjacency pairs theory in real conversations. The researcher also concerns the politeness strategies selected in adjacency pairs.

### **1.2 Research Questions**

1. How are adjacency pairs used in student-student and student-teacher in daily situations around FKIP Mataram University?

2. What factors determine the failure of implementation of adjacency pairs?
3. How is the politeness strategy implemented using adjacency pairs?

### **1.3 Purpose of The Study**

1. To examine the use of adjacency pairs between student-student and student-teacher at FKIP Mataram University.
2. To find out the factors that make the implementation of adjacency pairs success or fail.
3. To examine the implementation of politeness strategy in adjacency pairs.

### **1.4 Scope of The Study**

This study is limited to examine the adjacency pairs and politeness strategy in real communication at FKIP Mataram University. It focuses on the factors that contribute to the implementation of adjacency pairs between students-students, and students- teachers. Furthermore, this study also investigates how the politeness strategy influence in adjacency pairs. So, this thesis concludes the use of adjacency pairs and politeness strategy at FKIP Mataram University.

## **REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE**

### **2.1.1 Language Varieties Associated with Setting, Social Class, Status, Role, and Gender (Sex).**

There are several factors that influence the use of languages. The factors were described by Saville-Troike theory named language varieties. The diversity of communication used in the community emerged by age, sex, social status, and the setting in which communication takes place (Saville-Troike 2003).

Saville-Troike (2003:63) states in some communities a particular setting is required for an event to take place with choice of different language varieties. Language

restrictions or taboos are also often related to setting, such as constraints against talking about certain topics at the dining table, whistling in the house, or cursing in a place of worship (Saville-Troike 2003: 63). Languages which make extensive use of status-marking honorifics; the same speakers use different forms when speaking to someone in a superior versus someone in an inferior social position, even within the same conversation (Saville-Troike, 2003:75). Status is often marked in forms of address, and in different levels of formality corresponding to different levels of prestige or deference (Saville-Troike, 2003:73). Role refers to the position(s) an individual hold which entails particular expectations, rights, and responsibilities of others in the society: e.g. chief, minister of education, head of the family, friend (Saville-Troike, 2003: 73).

Sex and gender are two things that cannot be separated. According to Saville-Troike (2003:77), “gender” consider it a socially-constructed category, versus “sex,” which is biologically determined. Gunda (2010: 63-64) states gender refers to socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society consider appropriate for men and women. Saville Troike (2003:81) conclude that sex differences in language forms and patterns of interaction cannot be understood apart from situation and social factors.

### **2.1.2. Adjacency Pairs**

According to Yule, adjacency pairs always consist of a first part and a second part, produced by different speakers. The utterance of a first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pair (Yule 1996:77). Adjacency pairs always have a first part and a second part whereby a first part need a feedback of utterance which is corresponded with an expected response. Meanwhile, if there is no feedback (expected response) it can't be said as adjacency pairs.

In a book entitled *Sequence Organization in Interaction*, Schegloff (2007:13) characterized adjacency pairs into five features. (1) Composed of two turns. (2) An utterance by different speakers. (3) Adjacently placed; that is one after the other. (4)

The two turns are relatively ordered. (5) Adjacency pair has composed pair-type related (an appropriate statement and response of the first pair parts and second pair parts).

There are several types of adjacency pairs that were announced by experts:

1. Compliment → Acceptance/Refusal
2. Greeting → Greeting
3. Offer/Invitation → Acceptance/Refusal
4. Inform → Acknowledge
5. Question → Answer
6. Request → Acceptance / Refusal
7. Accusation/Blame → Admission/Denial
8. Assertion → Agreement/Disagreement

### **2.1.3 Politeness**

Politeness Strategy is created to avoid a conflict. Communication has to take into account about others face. Brown and Levinson declared that face, thus, is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly, attended to in interaction (cited in Seiwald 2011:4). The experts claimed two aspects that represent “face”, that is, positive face and negative face. Negative face whereby people to be respected and not impose by others. It is also used to address an autonomous participant. Meanwhile, Positive face whereby people treated as a member of society.

Acts which threaten either the positive or the negative face of the addressee are called face-threatening acts (FTAs). Therefore, to do an FTAs as considering the ‘face’ or ‘self-esteem’ politeness strategy is categorized by Brown and Levinson into four main strategies of politeness: bald on record strategy, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy, and off record indirect strategy (cited in Bouchara 2009:7).

A bald on-record strategy is conveying something bluntly without minimize imposition, this takes an urgency communication. In such case, the communicative intention that led a certain actor to do certain act clearly. Grice's Maxim suggests that, don't say less than is required, don't say more than is required, be relevant (cited in Bouchara 2009: 9). In conversation one's have a chance to take their turns and speak for what to speak, just take turns as what required. Both of them, S and H, tacitly agree that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interest of urgency or efficiency (Brown & Levinson, 1987:69)

A positive strategy is showing solidarity between the participant of conversation. They maintain that by choosing the term "solidarity" the emphasized on the common grounds' of the relation of the participants is more evident (Bouchara, 2009:10). Brown and Levinson (1987:103) stated that "S notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods). The action getting involved in this type is friend mutual action. It also can be sympathy by means of showing interest to hearer. Therefore, most people use this strategy when they engage in conversation with their friends. This strategy was implied for delivering optimistic, sympathy, compliment. This strategy is considering as the less impolite strategy.

A negative strategy is maintaining a distance between participant with observing someone right of possession and minimize the imposition. Thus, Yule (1996:62) stated negative politeness strategy is oriented to the person's negative face which tends to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time and concerns. It can be done directly or indirectly. Since this one is very polite, people usually use this one to communicate with who has a distance, for example, your new neighbor.

An off-record indirect strategy is telling something indirectly with considering not to impose participants, Hearer and Speaker, this found an ambiguity communication. The utterance of this strategy is often taking time to be interpreted. According to, Bouchara (2009:11) Off-record may lead to violation of Grice's conversational

maxims. (a) It is violated maxim's theory that the speaker says something explicitly relevant. (b) Being indirect, this may be done by exaggerating.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **3.1 Research Design**

The research method in this study is qualitative descriptive method. Qualitative method studies of small groups of people to guide and support the hypotheses. This research is qualitative in analyzing the factors of occurrence of adjacency pairs and the factors that may cause it to fail while the conversation has happened in FKIP Mataram University. Also, the researcher will investigate the politeness strategy that is implemented with adjacency pairs. The qualitative method helps the author to describe an information related to the study issues. This research was conducted at FKIP Mataram University. FKIP Mataram University is chosen as the setting by the researcher because she takes the accessibility, familiarity, closeness, and probability as a concern. This study will examine the conversation between students and teacher, also students with students in FKIP Mataram University.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 4.1. Adjacency Pairs in FKIP Mataram University

It has been described that the conversation between two different speakers is called adjacency pairs whereas pairs of utterance can be *greeting-greeting*, *compliment-acceptance/refusal*, *offer/invitation-acceptance/refusal*, *inform-acknowledge*, *question-answer*, etc. From the data, there were 21 conversations between student-student and student-teacher. The researcher found adjacency pairs that was successfully implemented at FKIP Mataram University dominated with different pair-parts which the first and the second utterance is different such as *question-answer*. There are also *request-acceptance* and *inform-knowledge*. The researcher found same pair-parts of adjacency pairs which is *greeting-greeting*, but this one is rarely implemented between student-student, the researcher mostly found this kind of adjacency pairs between student-teacher. To make it clear the writer make it into table:

### 4.2. The Factors Influences the Adjacency Pairs

#### 4.2.1. Adjacency Pairs Associated with Setting

##### Extract 1: examination room

- N:* Pak (salaman)  
Excuse me, Sir.
- T:* Kamu mau ujian?  
Will you be taking an exam?
- N:* Ndak, belum pak, sabtu inshaaAllah  
No, not yet sir, maybe on Saturday inshaaAllah
- T:* Ooh belum, ngapain ini?  
Ooh I see, what are you doing then?
- N:* Ini nungguin temen pak, hehe.  
I am waiting for my friend sir

The first extract showed the question which was asked by the speaker was answered immediately. In this sample, the implementation of adjacency pairs was question-answer. We could see from the **extract 1** this type of adjacency pair was

successful. The first extract has exposed the conversation in specific setting like what have drawn above that the implementation of adjacency pairs could run smoothly.

Thus, this study drawn conclusion that specific place as formal setting as one of the aspect that gave a significance impact in implementation of adjacency pair. The next extract has been provided in which conversation was occurred in corridor A building in FKIP Mataram University:

**Extract 2:**

- L: *Ibu*  
Excuse me, Mrs. Eka
- B: *Gimana kamu, udah selesai?*  
How about you< have you finished?
- L: *Doain bu*  
Wish me luck mrs.
- B: *Apa maksudnya doain?*  
Luck for what?
- L: *baru ujian proposal bu hehe*  
I just finished my proposal exam, Mrs.
- B: *Ooh ndak apa-apa*  
Oh I see.

The utterance of a first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pair (Yule 1996: 77). In extract 2, we could see that there was no expected response from L as second part. Thus, the researcher takes it as a concern to conclude that the adjacency pair that was occurred was fail.

In summary, the researcher found setting as one of the factors of that could break the consistency of adjacency pairs in FKIP Mataram University. It might be happened in specific or crowded space with some condition of the participant that engage in the conversation.

#### 4.2.2 Adjacency Pairs Associated with Social status and roles

##### Extract 3:

- S: *Assalamualaikum, misi pak.*  
Assalamualaikum, excuse me sir.
- T: *Walaikumsalam, mau ngapain ini?*  
Walaikumsalam, what are you doing here?
- S: *Mau cari pak Amin, Pak*  
I am looking for Mr. Amin, Sir
- T: *Ooh, belum ada tasnya itu*  
Oh, I don't see his bag yet.
- S: *Iya pak, mari.*  
Yes, sir, excuse me.

In Extract 3, the first line S was delivered by a greeting by saying "Assalamualaikum" and it have been replied by T with "Walaikumsalam". This phenomenon was telling us that the adjacency pairs that appeared in this conversation which was greeting-greeting become success. In line 2, S was not only responded by a greeting but also a question. In this case, S immediately answered T's question. T asked about what S want to do in those room. S answered that she wants to find a teacher namely Mr. Amin. These two application of adjacency pairs which are greeting-greeting (line 1&2) and question-answer (line 2&3) was success. The researcher statement is supported by Schegloff (2007:13) characterization "Adjacency pair has composed pair-type related (an appropriate statement and response of the first pair parts and second pair parts)".

##### Extract 4

- A: *Kapan acaranya miq?*  
When is the event, miq?
- M: *Acara apa?*  
What event?
- A: *yang skinnyfabs*  
The skinnyfabs.
- M: *Ooh, emang di story itu ndak ada?*  
Oh, didn't you see it in my story?
- A: *Tanggalnya? Ndak ada tanggal acaranya*  
What date? There is no date of the event.

- M: *Ada, saya lupa. (laughing), oh ini ni*  
There is, I forgot (laughing), oh here it is.
- A: *Ooh udah nih miq (laughing) (looking at the phone)*  
Oh, I am seeing it.

From the extract above, we can see without hesitation that the conversation didn't work with adjacency pairs. As we mentioned adjacency pairs that was emerged in this talk was question-answer. Yet, M reacted also with question by saying "Acara apa?". Again, in line (3) A replied by telling the name of guest star rather than the name of those event. There was unchanging sequence of the conversation, M still replied with question instead of telling the date.

In extract 3 and 4 we could see that social status have influenced the used of adjacency pairs in communication. As the researcher wrote before a superior social status belongs to the teacher in FKIP Mataram University because they take a role as academic advisor. For example ustadz (a role for Islamic teacher). To make sure the researcher examined two conversations between student-ustadz (Extract 5) and student-student (Extract 6).

#### **Extract 5**

- S: *Assalamualaikum, Pak.*  
Assalamualaikum, Sir.
- T: *Walaikumsalam, gimana kakakmu itu?*  
Walaikumsalam, how's your elder sister?
- S: *Alhamdulillah pak, baik.*  
Alhamdulillah sir, she is good.
- T: *Iya sudah, salam sama Ema itu, ilang-ilang saja.*  
Oh I see, send my regard to Ema, I never heard anything from her.
- S: *Iya pak, InshaAllah*  
Yes, sir, Insha Allah

#### **Extract 6:**

- D: *Hei mad!*  
Hi, mad!
- M: *Ada pulpenmu, Dan? Pinjem coba*  
Do you have a pen Dan? Can I borrow it?
- D: *Ni (memberikan bolpoint)*  
Here you are (passing the pen)

- M: *Bentar ya (mencari)*  
Wait (seeking for something)
- M: *Ni dan (memberikan pulpen) makasih*  
Here Dan (giving pen) thank you.
- D: *(mengangguk) Saya tunggu dikelas langsung.*  
(Nods) I'll wait you in class.
- M: *Iya iya.*  
Okay.

In (**extract 5**) this situation, S was greeting T by delivering “Assalamualaikum” and immediately replied by saying “Walaikumsalam” as greeting. As stated before “Assalamualaikum” was moslem that every moslem used it to greet someone else especially high spiritually people. Therefore, ustadz as spiritual teacher (T) was greeted by S with those word. Saville-Troike (2003: 75) emphasized the same speakers use different forms when speaking to someone in a superior position versus someone in an inferior social position. “the same speaker” here was pointed for students. Student as lower position chose a word carefully to speak with spiritual teacher as higher position in social community. It was proven by students in **extract 6**, we can see that he was greet his friend with “Hei, mad” instead of “assalamualaikum mad”. The researcher was asked D why he didn’t use a moslem greeting, he said that it happened naturally because they were friend so that they rarely use a moslem sign. This conversation implemented Saville-Troike statement in a cyclic or interaction event with several people in sequence, such as greetings, introductions, or thanks, the order of address may mark relative deference or closeness.

#### **4.2.3. The implementation of Adjacency Pairs Associated with Gender**

##### **Extract 7:**

- N: *Tina bagus blazernya*  
Tina, your blazer is nice.
- T: *(Senyum)*  
(Smiles)
- N: *Beli dimana?*  
Where did you buy it?
- T: *Jahit ini*  
It was tailor made.
- N: *Udah feeling dari bentuknya*

I can see it from its shape.

The conversation above happened between single-sex that were woman and woman. They were talking about fashion (clothes). In line (1) T was given a compliment by N for her blazer, N said “Tina bagus blazernya”. As announced in chapter 2, compliment was one of the type of adjacency pair. It should be responded by acceptance or refusal. As we can see, T didn’t respond it either accept the compliment or denied it. She may respond it by saying “thank you” or deny it by saying “no, you are overacting” or anything else. T just responded it by smiling. Then, the writer considers that both of them failed to implement the adjacency pairs which are compliment-acceptance refusal (line 1 and 2) and question-answer (line 3 and 4).

On the other hand, the researcher recorded the conversation between a man and a woman. They talk under the condition that the woman has just finished her thesis exam. From the conversation below, it looks like they were consistence in applying adjacency pairs.

### **Extract 8**

- A: *Banyak di komen?*  
Did you get many comments?
- N: *Iya, banyak, sampe bliographinya.*  
So many, even the bibliography.
- A: *Ndak apa apa, yang penting udah, terserah hasilnya mau kaya gimana,*  
It’s okay, it’s been finished, whatever the result.
- N: *Ndak banyak sih revisinya, Cuma format anunya itu.*  
The revision is not much, but the format.
- A: *Penulisannya itu, kalo itu jak biasa.*  
That’s the writing format, it is usual.
- N: *Iya*  
Yes.

The first line, A (Man) asked whether N (woman) passed the exam with many comments or not. N immediately answered by saying “iya” emphasized it with “banyak sampe bibliographinya”. To show his appreciation, the man said “Ndak apa apa, yang penting udah, terserah hasilnya mau gimana,”. Moreover, N inform to A that the

comment was about the format of writing “Ndak banyak sih revisinya, Cuma format anunya itu”. A recognize the information and acknowledge it by saying “Penulisannya itu, kalo itu jak biasa.”. The conversation between this man and woman accomplished the sequences of adjacency pairs that was question-answer and inform-acknowledge.

The researcher also recorded the talks between two men to emphasize whether single-sex conversation make a significant possibility of a failure in applying adjacency pairs or not.

### **Extract 9**

- J: *Kapan itu batasnya?*  
When is the payment limit?
- A: *belum ada uang saya sekarang, 2 juli, eh 2 agustus*  
I don't have money right now, 2<sup>nd</sup> of July, eh 2<sup>nd</sup> of August
- J: *Ooh*  
Ooh
- A: *Ni saya follow di ig, dia gila, dia jualan baju, tapi ndak dia niat anuin, cara promonya, follow dia di ig ni*  
I followed him on instagram, he's crazy, he's selling clothes, but he doesn't intend to, the way he promote, follow him in this Instagram.
- J: *Ndak mau men*  
No man.
- A: *Kenapa?*  
Why?
- J: (Menggeleng)  
(Shook his head)
- A: *Dia jual beli, tapi aneh, dia gila*  
He buys and sell, but he is weird and crazy

The conversation above was between two men. They were discussing about an entertainer that would be present in some event. In this situation the researcher notice that they were close friend since the first year of academic in FKIP Mataram University. There should be two kind of adjacency pairs sequences that were question answer and inform- acknowledge but they failed to implement both of them.

In summary, the writer took a conclusion that gender has taken place in success or failure of the implementation of adjacency pairs. It is based on the topics among the

participants. Moreover, Gender cannot be separated from situation and social distance. Saville Troike (2003:81) conclude that sex differences in language forms and patterns of interaction cannot be understood apart from situation and social factors.

### 4.3 Implementation of Politeness Strategy in Adjacency Pairs

#### FINDING OF THE USE OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN ADJACENCY PAIRS AT FKIP MATARAM UNIVESITY

No	Dialogues	Strategy
1	<p><b>Extract 1: examination room</b></p> <p>N: <i>Pak (salaman)</i> Excuse me, Sir.</p> <p>T: <i>Kamu mau ujian?</i> Will you be taking an exam?</p> <p>N: <i>Ndak, belum pak, sabtu inshaaAllah</i>  No, not yet sir, maybe on Saturday inshaaAllah</p> <p>T: <i>Ooh belum, ngapain ini?</i> Ooh I see, what are you doing then?</p> <p>N: <i>Ini nungguin temen pak, hehe.</i> I am waiting for my friend sir</p>	<p>Bald on-record (direct question)</p> <p>Negative politeness: (give deference)</p> <p>Bald-on (direct question)</p> <p>Negative politeness (give deference)</p>
3	<p><b>Extract 2:</b></p> <p>S: <i>Assalamualaikum, misi pak.</i> Assalamualaikum, excuse me sir.</p> <p>T: <i>Waalaiikumsalam, mau ngapain ini?</i> Waalaiikumsalam, what are you doing here?</p> <p>S: <i>Mau cari pak Amin, Pak</i> I am looking for Mr. Amin, Sir</p> <p>T: <i>Ooh, belum ada tasnya itu</i> Oh, I don't see his bag yet.</p> <p>S: <i>Iya pak, mari.</i> Yes, sir, excuse me.</p>	<p>Negative Pol: give deference</p> <p>Bald-on: direct question</p> <p>Negative politeness: give deference Off record- give association clue</p> <p>Negative pol- give difference</p>
	<p><b>Extract 3</b></p> <p>A: <i>Banyak di komen?</i> Did you get many comments?</p> <p>N: <i>Iya, banyak, sampe bliographynya.</i> So many, even the bibliography.</p> <p>A: <i>Ndak apa apa, yang penting udah, terserah hasilnya mau kaya gimana,</i> It's okay, it's been finished, whatever the result.</p>	<p>Bald on- direct</p> <p>Positive Politeness - sympathy</p>

	<p>N: <i>Ndak banyak sih revisinya, Cuma format anunya itu.</i> The revision is not much, but the format.</p> <p>A: <i>Penulisannya itu, kalo itu jak biasa.</i> That's the writing format, it is usual.</p> <p>N: <i>Iya</i> Yes.</p>	<p>Positive Politeness - attend H</p> <p>Positive Politeness - Seek Agreement</p>
--	--	---

From the finding above we can see that **Extract 1** was the conversation between student and teacher and they followed the sequences of adjacency pairs. The teacher (T) asked student with direct question. As we referred to Brown & Levinson theory that the speaker delivers an utterance bluntly without minimizing the face threat. The teacher didn't consider whether that expression impose the hearer (student) or not. The researcher conclude that the teacher used *bald-on record politeness*. The students (N) answered the question by saying "Ndak, belom pak, sabtu Inshaa Allah". There is a form of address "Pak" and moslem sign "InshaaAllah" and the speaker (N) was optimistic that the examination would be on Saturday. As stated in Yule (1996:62) negative politeness strategy is oriented to the person's negative face which tends to show deference. Those strategies also followed the rest of conversation in which the teacher applied *Bald-on record politeness* and the student used *Negative Politeness*.

As noted before, negative politeness control negative face to indicate deference. In this community, the deference belongs to the teacher as a high status and power. For this reason, the student, in **extract 2**, treated the hearer that was the teacher as superior. Take a look, in line (1), "S" delivered greeting using moeslim sign and followed by saying "*misi*" "excuse me" and the form of addressee "*Pak*" "Sir". The utterance "Assalamualaikum, misi pak." can be said as negative politeness. The teacher asked a direct question by saying "Waalai kumsalam, mau ngapain ini?". The students immediately answered, again the student used the form of address which mean negative politeness "Mau cari pak Amin, Pak". In line (4) instead of giving clear respond, the teacher gave a clue about the presence of "Pak Amin" by stating "Ooh, belum ada tasnya itu". In this conversation the writer found that the teacher used *bald-on record and off-record politeness* while the student exerted *negative politeness*.

In **extract 3** presented that the sequences of adjacency pairs run smoothly. N which had finished the examination was asked by A whether she past it with many comments or not by delivering direct question “Banyak di komen?”. In line (2) N answered the question with bluntly statement “Iya, banyak, sampe bibliographynya”. Furthermore, (A) appreciated (N)’s work by showing his sympathy. He declared the sympathy by conveying “Ndak apa apa, yang penting udah, terserah hasilnya mau kaya gimana,”. Brown and levinson stated that sympathy can be expressed by means of showing interest to hearer. In this circumstance, (A) appreciated (N) because he was interested in her effort. In line (4), (N) using politeness strategy that was “notice, attend to H”. In this utterance, (N) as speaker recognize the hearer (A) interest, so that she said “Ndak banyak sih revisinya” and continued by saying “ Cuma format anunya itu” . In the last line (A) seek agreement about his pair statement “Cuma format anunya itu”. He conveyed “Penulisannya itu, kalo itu jak biasa.”, these word showed that he seeks agreement about the previous statement. For that reason, the writer conclude that this conversation applied Bald-on record politeness and positive politeness.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### 5.1 CONCLUSION

This study analyzes the use of adjacency pairs and politeness strategy in FKIP Mataram University. Based on the result of the data investigation, this research concludes that the types of adjacency pairs happened in FKIP Mataram University were *question-answer*, *request-acceptance*, *greeting-greeting* and *inform-acknowledge*. Most of them used different pair-parts of adjacency pairs that was *question-answer*.

Factors which caused the failure of the implementation of adjacency pairs were the setting, social status and roles, gender(sex). Politeness strategy between student-student mostly used bald-on record politeness and positive politeness they rarely off-record politeness. Meanwhile, the conversation between student and teacher was occurred by using Negative politeness and Off-record politeness they were rarely used positive politeness.

## **5.2 SUGGESTION**

1. the result of this study might be useful to extend the knowledge of the students at FKIP Mataram University about adjacency pairs.
2. the result of this study might be useful to enhance the knowledge of the students about politeness strategies.
3. The next researcher may analyze the use of adjacency pairs and politeness strategies in region language.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bouchara, Abdelaziz. 2009. *Politeness in Shakespeare: Applying Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to Shakespeare comedies*. Humburg. DiplomaticaVerlag.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Gunda, Masiwa Ragies. *The Bible and Homosexuality in Zimbabwe: A Socio-historical Analysis of the political, cultural and Christian arguments in the homosexual public debate with special references to the use of Bible*. 2010. Africa. University of Bamberg Press.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. 2003. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction Third Edition*. USA. Blackwell Publishing.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Seiwald, Regina. 2011. *The Importance of Face in Politeness Theory*. Germany. GRIN Verlag
- Yule George. 1996. *Pragmatic*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.