**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

* 1. **Background of the Research**

Conversation is very important in human communication. As Paltridge (2006:107) states “ Conversation is the main way in which people come together, exchange information, negotiate, and maintain social relations.” It includes asking, answering, requesting, disagreeing, offering and so forth. Conversation occurs among people, when the conversation produced by the second speaker which has a relation to the first speaker such as a question by the first speaker should be followed by an answer of the second speaker.

The result of both relation of talk is called paired utterance, such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, farewell-farewell, request-acceptance/refusal and so fort are considered as adjacency pairs. As stated by Paltridge (2006:115) “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”. Thus, adjacency pairs is a paired utterance that is produced by different speaker which occur in interaction and it has relation to each other. Through adjacency pairs, participants are allowed to start conversation, negotiate deal, relate facts, change topics, and end the conversation (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973:296).

Adjacency pairs occur in everyday conversation interaction. Conversation interaction is categorized into two distinctions as the boundaries between institutional talk and ordinary conversations. Heritage and Clayman (2010) states that institutional talk is interaction that happens for example in the classroom interaction. In classroom interaction the members of class such as teacher and student will interact and start a conversation to exchange information, and it can be found in every classroom situation such as in thesis examination presentation.

As we know thesis examination presentation is a gate for the student to obtain a degree after years of studying, until compiling scientific papers that are required by research. Besides, thesis examination also becomes the main requirement to finish the study. There are three sessions in thesis examination presentation, the first session is presentation, the second session is question-answer session from the examiner to the examinee. Since, thesis examination presentation is very important for students to reach their next step, the students should pass their final thesis examination. Therefore, the response from the examinee in this session is very much taken into account, and the last session is an announcement.

In this way, the researcher will focus on analyzing adjacency pairs on the second session of thesis examination presentation in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, because presentation is always used as a learning medium for the students especially college students, that is why adjacency pairs has important role in doing presentation especially on the question-answer session in order to avoid the failure did by the second speaker in responding the first speaker. Therefore, by following or applying the principles of adjacency pairs in conversation, the presentation will run smoothly. Besides, on the second session of thesis examination presentation there is a conversational interaction that occurs between the examiner and the examinee that adjacency pairs might occurs. Since, in conversation interaction adjacency pairs is one of the basic unit on which sequences in conversation are built (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). Adjacency pairs have been widely explored by many researchers for many instances, such as, Jayanti (2017), Fauzia (2015), Hasan (2015), and Rui & Ting (2014).

Based on the explanation above, the researcher wants to analyze the types of adjacency pairs that appear in conversation interaction on the second session of thesis examination presentation of English literature students in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. Besides, the researcher also wants to analyze the preference structures and context of response that appear in the conversation interaction on the second session of thesis examination presentation of English literature students in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia.

* 1. **Research Question**

According to the background of the study which has been elaborated previously, the researcher formulates the problem into:

1. What are the types of adjacency pairs and the preference structures that appear in thesis examination presentation?
2. In what context certain preference structures of response are used in thesis examination presentation?
	1. **Research Objective**

Considering the formulation of the problem which has been elaborated before, the researcher decides the objective of the study as followed:

1. To identify the types of adjacency pairs and the preference structures that appears in thesis examination presentation.
2. To analyse the context of preference structures used in thesis examination presentation.
	1. **Significance of the Research**

The result of this study is expected to help speakers to know the way how to organize utterance in building conversational interaction in order to make the conversation runs well and also it can be used as one of the sources of information for those who need it, such as students of the study program of English language and literature majoring in linguistics study, for English teachers, as an alternative idea to teach and for other researchers, this study expected that the result of this research is used as a starting point to conduct further research on adjacency pairs.

* 1. **Scope of the Research**

In this study, the researcher focuses on identifying and analyzing the types of adjacency pairs and the preference structures on the second session of thesis examination presentation, which the data were taken from two students who conducted their thesis examination presentation majoring English literature at Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia on March 1st up to April 30th, 2018. The researcher will investigate the types of adjacency pairs and then organized into preferred and dispreferred adjacency pairs by using theory of Schegloff and Sacks (1973), and Levinson (1983). Besides, the contexts of response are also analyzed.