



THE USE OF ADJACENCY PAIRS ON FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICE (F&B) OPERATIONS BY THE STAFF AND GUEST IN RESTAURANT AND CAFE WITHIN SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONE (KEK) MANDALIKA CENTRAL LOMBOK 2020

by

Ainul Yakin¹⁾ & Endang Sriwahyuni²⁾

^{1,2}Politeknik Pariwisata Lombok

Email: ¹ainul.yakin@ppl.ac.id & ²endang.wahyuni@ppl.ac.id

Abstract

Adjacency pair is the most basic forms of speech which is used to produce conversation. This study aimed to know how to apply the Adjacency Pairs into daily communication on food and beverage services operations in restaurants and cafes at Special Economic Zone (KEK) of Central Lombok. Grice's, McCarthy's and Adisty's theory were used as the main theory amid the current study. While descriptive qualitative method as the research method, with data collection techniques by using, observation, interviews, questionnaires, and voice recordings. Miles and Huberman (2014) theory was used as the technique for analyzing the data within four stages of the processes; data collection, data reduction, data display / drawing and data verification / final conclusion. The results of the data analysis are expected to be able to give conclusions and answers of the problems which had been determined in this study. The result of the study showed that almost 100% of the expressions on the three theories used by the respondents had the similarities between AP in Conversation Analysis and Sequence of Service (SOS) at the restaurants and cafes. A significant difference could be seen in Grice's theory which dominantly appeared as much (26%) as the expressions found in several restaurants in Kuta Madalika, then McCarthy's theory was dominantly used (24%) and Adisty's (0.1%) was dominantly used, and the rest was used in the form of expected expressions and relevant with the existing theory.

Keywords: Adjacency Pair, Restaurant And Cafe Operations & (KEK) Mandalika

INTRODUCTION

Whatever else people do when they come together, whether they play, fight, make love, or make automobiles, they talk. People live in a world of language, talk to their friends, associates, wives and husbands, lovers, teachers, parents, rivals, and even enemies. Talk to bus drivers and total strangers. Talk face-to-face and over the telephone, and everyone responds with more talk. Television and radio further swell this torrent of words. Hardly a moment of the waking lives is free from words, and even in dreams people talk and are talked to. People also talk when there is no one to answer. Sometimes talk aloud in sleep. And also talk to the pets and sometimes to the people themselves, Fromkin, et. al., (2011). Language is used for many purposes. It can be

for expressing feelings, asking questions, protesting, criticizing, making requests, promising, thanking, insulting, apologizing, and say hello and goodbye. In other word, by using language human can transmit a message, information or any ideas to hearer to have a conversation. One of the very popular term in conversation is adjacency pair where people transferring the information toward one another.

The adjacency pair may also create people to have conversation toward each other, transferring their ideas in several contexts. Sacks and Schegloff (1973;1979) predominantly developed the adjacency pair in which people form or design their speech unconsciously to meet the expected needs of others in the conversation. It is one of the vital



terms discussing in socio-linguistics. It is also a type of utterance used by a speaker which requires a particular type of utterance by another speaker. Generally speaking, adjacency pairs are the utterances in a dialogue which occurs in pairs.

Sacks and Schegloff (1973); McCarthy (1991) revealed that adjacency pair is the most basic forms of speech that is used to produce conversation. On the other hand, it is an ordered pair of adjacent utterances spoken by two different speakers. Once the first utterance is spoken, the second is required in which pairs of utterance are mutually dependent. For instance, a question predicts an answer and the answer presupposes a question. Adjacency pairs is also part of Turn Taking and also exchange therefore in exchange and turn taking component focused on the evaluation of talking and the correctness of conversation while the adjacency pairs just focused from the statement of first pair part, and the response with the second pair part.

In connection with theory above, the researcher took the chance to have a research under the adjacency pair terms since a lot of domestic tourists and foreign tourists tend to enjoy a variety of culinary in restaurants and cafes around the Mandalika KEK Central Lombok. Based on the results observations, there are still the uneven quality of services shown by waiters and waitresses in several restaurants and cafes around the Central Lombok KEK Mandalika managed by local communities. Therefore, conducting research on the quality of food and beverage services in restaurants and cafes in the Special Economic Zone (KEK) Madalika, Central Lombok is necessary by analyzing the Adjacency Pairs in Sequence of service (SOS) of Restaurant and Cafe in Special Economic Zone (KEK) Mandalika Central Lombok.

This research focused on finding out the questions; are there any same utterance between adjacency pairs in conversational analysis and adjacency pairs in restaurant operations? and

what are the differences between adjacency pairs in Conversational analysis and restaurant operation adjacency pairs?

To support the current research, some theories are derived from three main theories revealed by the experts; Grice (1989), McCarthy (1991), and Adsty et. all., (2012) are used. These theories concern on sociolinguistics discussing on the terms called Adjacency pairs.

Grice (1989) stated that there are seven type of utterances function and seven expected response that are: 1). greeting-greeting, 2). offer – acceptance/rejection, 3). request-acceptance/rejection, 4). question-answer, 5). complaint-excuse, 6). inform-acknowledge and 7). Leave- taking – leave –taking. When the First speaker requires the addressee to provide an answer in the following turn, thus completing the adjacency pair. For example when FPP saying that “*What is your name*” so the addressee will say “*My Name Is John*” the addressee sometime answer with the relevant response as we see from john but in different time it can be irrelevant or un expected response such as: the addressor say “*what is your name*” Un satisfactory response could be “*I think it is not important to mention my name*” this response appear based on the mood of the addressor of dependent on the situation being conversation.

McCarthy (1991) stated that Adjacency pairs consist of five utterances function and also five expected response examples: 1). greeting-greeting, 2). Congratulation-thanks, 3). apology-acceptance, 4). inform-acknowledge and 5). Leave taking - leave taking. McCarthy called imperative pair-part can be classified functionally as an informing move, in light of the acknowledging second pair-part. As the example between ticket collector and the passenger on a train: Ticket operator: (inspecting passenger’s ticket) Change at Peterborough. And the passenger answers: *Thank you*, McCarthy (1991). It was the same with other theory but in different dialect in



saying the utterance, the disagreement response of the addressee is depending on the co-presence of the both parts. The principles of Adjacency pairs and how they are realized based on McCarthy is in natural speech point to the importance of creating minimal contexts in field of common communication. In addition, he also stated that the important of Follow-Up move and signaling function we can see from the significant of unit in discourse.

Adsty et. all., (2012) asserted that adjacency pairs also consist of seven utterance function and seven response, it was the same with McCarthy theory but in Adisty focused on the dispreferred response only not in preferred response basically the same because was in same pattern, one utterance make the different like in command – acceptance/rejection. These are the result of the research of Adisty at all Research in the class room research but in this case we try to apply these number of theory in terms of F and B Service adjacency pairs it is can be stated as follows. First, there are seven types of adjacency pairs containing dispreferred response: (1) command-rejection, (2) assessment-dis-agreement, (3) question-dispreferred answer, (4) request-refusal, (5) assessment-dis-preferred agreement, (6) offer-rejection, and (7) complaint-denial.

Paltridge,(2000) also revealed some sequence of services at restaurant operations such as; Greeting, Asking the Reservation, Escorting the guest, Seating the guest, Unfolding the guest napkin, Pouring Ice water, Offering Aperitif drink, Presenting Menu, Taking Order, Repeating Order, Distributing Captain Order Slip, Adjusting Cover, Serving Bread & Butter, Serving Beverage, Serving Food, Clearing Up, Crumbing Down, Adjusting Cover Equipment for Dessert, Serving Dessert, Clearing Up, Billing, and Farewell to the guest. These sequences of services are commonly applied in the context of hotel and restaurant services toward the guests.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

Since the data are in the form of words, therefore, the researcher applied descriptive qualitative research to reveal the use of adjacency pairs on Food and Beverage Service (F&B) operations toward the staff and guest in restaurant and cafe at special economic zone of Mandalika Central Lombok. Denzin and Lincoln (1998) revealed that qualitative research involves the studies use and collections of variety of empirical materials- case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, historical, instructional, and visual texts- that describe routine and problematic movement, and meanings in possible life.

Research Place and Time Schedule

This research took place at Restaurant and cafe at Special Economic Zone (KEK) Mandalika Central Lombok. And it was conducted within four months starting from September to December 2020.

Resources of the Data

The resources of the data of this research were in the form of primary and secondary data. Primary data was gathered from restaurant and cafe in central Lombok. While secondary data was taken from the internet, some literatures, books and electronics media which were relevant to this research. The data was also taken from respondent's conversation recording in the determined place.

Data Collection Method

To obtain the data needed, the data was taken through some methods; 1) Document research was done to obtain theoretical references relating to this research. 2) Field Research was conducting through conversational between researcher and informants, conversation between people and other people, and the last a conversation between people and another group at restaurant operations such as; waiter/ss, supervisor and guest. 3) Observation was taken through field observations and recording phenomena that occur in the field / research location at Kuta



Mandalika Central Lombok. 4) Semi-structured interview was done by giving question and discussion with informants containing interview guidelines consisted of questions that had been set by the researchers. 5) Recording data based on reality was given toward the informant from restaurant and cafe in the area of Mandalika such as, waiter/ss, supervisors and customers by recording them during the interviews and discussion session.

Data Analysis

After obtaining the data needed, then the researchers analyzed it through Miles and Huberman’s (2014) theory consisted of four stages of processes: 1). Data Collection, 2). Data Reduction, 3). Data Display and 4). Conclusion / verification of data.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Data Finding During the Research

When the researcher took the data recorded from the informant which consist of waiter/waitress, supervisor and manager and guest, the researcher found many different expected responses and dis-preferred response of utterance was delivered by the informant at Kuta Mandalika as the same of adjacency pairs.

Data Obtained from Observation

Data from the observation are gathered from field research were indicated that this theory of AP generally has the same item of service with the same pattern and also have the different expressions. The same expression generally about: Greeting, requesting, complaint, command and leave - taking/farewell. The data gathered during the observation on the greeting function between waiter and guest they were: *Good morning, good afternoon and good night the guest answered that good morning and good evening on the kinds of expected response. On the other cases that some guest did not answer the guest directly, but the waiter is the prominent position to do this utterance these expression kinds of dis-preferred response.*

Data Obtained from Questionnaire

The data obtained from the restaurants and cafes at kuta Mandalika were various number of responses. The differentiate between policy and the Conversational Analysis between waiter and customer. When the researcher asked to the writer of how did you know about sequence of service at restaurant then the writer commonly answer that they know the SOS and the service operation at the restaurant and they used that terms in every day operations. At Bamba cafe answered that they know much about SOS but in the level of operation in every day they did not use all of that items but they prefer to use the half of them.

When the researcher asked about what is the guest response if there is a complaint, they answer that we try to be potion and always hear what the guest comment while saying *yes, I do and we do apologize of that mistakes.* After servicing the guest with a hospitality nuance generally they express their thankful by giving a gift, saying thank you for the warm service and said *“I am glad to be a guest at this restaurant”*

Data Obtained from Interview in Several Restaurants at Kuta Mandalika

The interview was done in several restaurants and cafes located in Kuta Mandalika. They were; Kemangi Bar and Resto, JM Hotel, Panfila Hotel, Melati Hotel, Puri Rinjani And Plate Bar and Restaurant. The researcher found that in every restaurant and cafe at Kuta Mandalika has different kinds of experience during the restaurant service.

Here is the readers’ dominantly rouse up at the field study as we can see at the table founded below:

Table 1 Seventh type’s theory from Adisty.

No	Utterance Function	Expected Response	Dispreferred /Refusal response
1	Command- “Take the Water Goblet, Please”	<i>Yes, sir/madam</i>	“Yes, Wait for momment”
2	Assessment – “You have bad score of this jobs?”	<i>Ok, I will try my best</i>	“I don’t Agree about that”
3	Request – it is ok if I take this food?”	<i>Yes, I Think is Good</i>	<i>it’s going to back tomorrow”</i>



4	Question - "What does this book for?"	The book for the guest List Sir...	"just for toys"(disprprfered)
5	Assessment - "It's wrong answer"	Oh really, thank you for the assesment, Sir...	" I don't Think so"
6	Inform - "your book is here?"	Thak You Madam/Sir	"No, over there"
7	Complaint - "I don't agree this opinion"	Yes, Its Ok let we discuse more..	" No, Thank you"

The table above found that the Adisty's theory was not fully applied at the restaurant operation area at Kuta Mandalika. The theory offers the dis-preferred response while the real operation used the expected response so from this result, we know that this theory has the same utterance by the different responses. The data was found at the different restaurant and cafe such as: Kemangi Bar and Resto, JM Hotel, Panfila Hotel, Melati Hotel, Puri Rinjani and Plate Bar and Restaurant. Whereas, the next finding comes from Grice's theory, the data mainly found unexpected response, Question, informing and Leave-Taking.

Table 2 Seventh type's theory from Grice

NO	UTTERANCE FUNCTION	EXPECTED RESPONSE	DIS-PREFERRED RESPONSE
1	Greeting "hi", hello"	"Oh, hi"	
2	Offer - "would you like to visit the museum with me this evening?"	I'd love to	"I am Sorry I have any activities until this night"
3	Request - Is it OK if I borrow this book?"	"I'd rather you didn't	it's due back at the library tomorrow"
4	Question - "Are you ready to order sir/madam?"	"Yes, Please!"	Sorry I am Still Busy...!!
5	Complaint - "It's awfully cold in here"	"Oh, sorry, I'll close the window"	
6	Inform - "Your table is in here sir/madam?"	" Yes, Thank You"	No, I want you to cange the table, yach
7	Leave-taking/ degreeting - "see you"	"Yeah, See You Later"	No Command

The table above showed that the respondents at restaurant area of Madalika used the Grice's theory. It indicated that there were seven types of utterances function and seven expected responses explored: 1). greeting-greeting/dis-preferred response, 2). offer - acceptance/rejection, 3). request-acceptance/rejection, 4). question-answer, 5).

complaint-excuse, 6). inform-acknowledge and 7). Leave-taking - leave-taking.

The third data finding from McCarthy theory with five types of Utterance Function and responses during Restaurant Operations at Covid -19 era.

Table 3 Five types of McCarthy theory:

NO	UTTERANCE FUNCTION	EXPECTED RESPONSE	DIS-PREFERRED RESPONSE
1	Greeting "hello"	" hi"	No Command
2	Congratulation - "Congratulation for your won of the show"	"Thank you"	No. Thank you I don't need a Gift, I don't need the reward, sorry I don't need it.
3	Apology -I am sorry for stepping your put "	"Ok" No worry"	"No I don't need your sorry"
4	Inform - "that is your book"	"Yes, I see"	Sorry, I Know Thank you, sorry I don't need your information, sorry and no expressions.
5	Leave-taking - "by, see you"	"bye bye"	Sorry I will not Come here again, Im not coming again, may I leave this restaurant, I think I am not here again.

According to McCarthy stated that Adjacency pairs consist of five utterances function and also five expected response examples: 1). greeting-greeting, 2). Congratulation-thanks, 3). apology-acceptance, 4). Complaint-excuse and 5). Leave taking - leave taking. It was the same with other theory but in different utterance in saying the response, the disagreement response of the addressee is depending on the co-presence of the both part as the previous statement of McCarthy.

Data Obtained from Audio-Recording

The result of data obtained when the theory combined together it was found eleven AP in Restaurant operations language the third theory it was realised that the evidence of Adjacency pairs widely constructed comparing with the third theory of CA Adjacency Pairs. Restaurant AP has more complete than the theory stated, it was found that the variation of discourse in terms of daily communication, Restaurant operations of AP covered all item of



Conversational Analysis AP that we can see from the next explanation.

There were many kinds of phenomenon which is impacted to the conversational analysis not only about the ambience of the restaurant operation but also carried out from the problem of the guest individually and collectively. The response comes from the guest was impacted to the mood and psychological experience. During the process of services at each restaurant at kuta Mandalika. **The Similarities Between the Theory and Sequence of Service (SOS) at Restaurant and Cafe at Kuta Mandalika Central Lombok**

The data below deals with what kinds of utterance AP form SPP have been appear during the operations between one hotel to the other restaurant.

Table 4. The Similarites of SOS and the Theories Authority

NO	SEQUENCE OF SERVICE	ADJACENCY PAIR THEORIES	THEORIES AUTHORITY
1	Greeting	Greeting	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
2	Asking the Reservation	Question	Grice and Adisty
3	Escorting the guest	Question	Grice and Adisty
4	Seating the guest	Requesting	Grice and Adisty
5	Unfolding the guest napkin	Apology	Mc Carthy
6	Pouring Ice water	Question	Grice and Adisty
7	Offering Aperitif drink	Offer, Requesting	Grice and Adisty
8	Presenting Menu	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
9	Taking Order	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
10	Repeating Order	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
11	Distributing Captain Order Slip	Inform, Complaint	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
12	Adjusting Cover	Apology, inform	McCarthy, Grice and Adisty
13	Serving Bread & Butter	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
14	Serving Beverage	Inform	c
15	Serving Food	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
16	Clearing Up	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
17	Crumbing Down	Apology	McCarthy, Grice and Adisty
18	Adjusting Cover Equipment for Dessert	Apology	McCarthy, Grice and Adisty
19	Serving Dessert	Inform	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
20	Clearing Up	Command	Adisty
21	Billing	Command, Assessment	Adisty

22	Farewell to the guest	Leave-Taking	Grice, Carthy and Adisty
23	- Another cases	Congratulation	Adisty

The table above tells that the similarities of the theory and the AP of restaurant operations commonly has the same utterance from the beginning of SOS about how to greet the guest until farewell.

The Differences between AP Theory and AP Sequence of Service (SOS) at Restaurant and Cafe at Kuta Mandalika Central Lombok

The emergence of different utterance is because of the restaurant ambience and restaurant model of service, the table below explains the differences of utterances were commonly used at restaurant operation between the guests and the staffs of each theory at Kuta Mandalika Central Lombok.

Table. 5 The Emergence of Gricean Theory During the Service

NO	Hotel/resto Name	GRICEAN THEORY													
		1Greeting		2Offering		3Request		4Quest		5Complaint		6Inform		7Leave-taking	
		Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss
1	Dream Hotel		1					1	1						
2	Ranjani Hotel									1					1
3	Kuta Paradise							2	2		2				
4	Kemangi Bar and Resto							3	3		3				3
5	Bamba Resto							1	1		1				2
6	Jvana Resort			1	2			2	2		2			2	2
7	Villa Sorga's														
8	Puri Ranjani							1	1		1			1	1
9	JM Hotel							3						3	
10	Segara anak Hotel and restaurant							1	1		1			1	1
11	Plate Bar and Restoran		2					2	2		2			2	1
12	Shu Restaurant							2	2		2			2	1
13	Panflia Hotel							3	3		3			3	3
14	Melani Hotel							3						2	2
15	Ashtari					1		2	2		2			2	2
16	Villa Hotel							1	1		1			1	1
	Total	3		1		6		24	22		26			18	
	Percentage	0,3%	0	0,1%	0	0,6%		2,4%	2,2%		2,6%			1,8%	

Comparing at the theory of AP the conversation at restaurant was different because of the reality and the different situation of services. Focusing on these kinds of response, another utterance also emerges such as: questioning 24 utterances (2.4%), 22 Utterances (2.2%) Complaint, requesting and 6 Utterances (0.6%), Leave-Taking 18 Utterances (1.8%). Greeting 3 utterances (0.3%) and Offering 1 Utterance (0.1%). Those utterances and response function were Dis-preferred Responses.

**Table 6 The Emergence of McCarthy Theory During the Service**

DISTRIBUTION RESULT			MCCARTHY								
NO	Hotel/resto Name	1Greeting		2Conratulation		3Apology		4Inform		5Leave-taking	
	Responses	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss
1	Dream Hotel	1									
2	Rinjani Hotel		1					1		1	
3	Kuta Paradise			1	1			2			
4	Kemangi Bar and Resto		2		2			2		2	
5	Bamba Resto										
6	Jivana Resort		2					2		2	
7	Villa Sorga's										
8	Puri Rinjani		1		1			2		2	
9	JM Hotel		3		3			3			
10	Segara anak Hotel and restaurant		1		1			1			
11	Plate Bar and Restoran		1		1			2		2	
12	Shu Restaurant			1	2						
13	Panfila Hotel		3		3			3		3	
14	Melati Hotel							2		2	
15	Ashtari		1		1			2		2	
16	Villa Hotel		1								1
	Total	1	17	1	15			24		17	
	Percentage	0,1%	1,7%	0,1%	1,5%			2,4%		1,7%	

The utterance dominantly emerges at no 4 *Information* Utterance. McCarthy was explained that dominantly responses comes from the *information* utterance such as: *The way to toilet you may go ahead and turn left at the corner you will see the sign, the guest said that "No thank you, don't tell me I know where is it. The responses of the guest always used dis-preferred utterance of more people at restaurant operations. 24 utterances (2.4) were emerging at the 16 Hotel/cafe at Mandalika Area.*

The next utterance at Leave-Taking 17 Utterances (1.7%), Greeting 17 Utterances (1.7%), congratulation 15 utterances (1.5%), 1 Utterance (0.1%) was Expected responses, this response is usual or response which making the guest safety and secure (to serve the guest to be an excellent service.

Table 7 The Emergence of Adisty Theory During the Service

DISTRIBUTION RESULT			ADISTY THEORY												
NO	Hotel/resto Name	1Command		2Assesment		3Request		4Quest		5Inform		6Assesment		7Complaint	
	Responses	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss	Expc	Diss
1	Dream Hotel	1													
2	Rinjani Hotel	1	1		1					1		1		1	
3	Kuta Paradise	1	2	2	2			1		2		2		2	
4	Kemangi Bar and Resto	3	3	3	3	1		3		3		3		3	
5	Bamba Resto	1	1	1	1			1		1		1		1	
6	Jivana Resort	2	2	2	2	2		2		2		2		2	
7	Villa Sorga's														
8	Puri Rinjani	2	1	2	1	1		1		2		2		2	
9	JM Hotel	3	3	3	3	3		3		3		3		3	
10	Segara anak Hotel and restaurant	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	
11	Plate Bar and Restoran	2	2	2	2	2		2		2		2		2	
12	Shu Restaurant	1	1	2	1									1	
13	Panfila Hotel	3	3	3	3	3		3		3		3		3	
14	Melati Hotel	3	3	3	3	3		3		3		3		3	
15	Ashtari	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	
16	Villa Hotel	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	
	Total	25	1	25	1	27	19	1	22	25	1	26	1		
	Percentage	2,5%	0,1%	2,5%	0,1%	2,7%	1,9%	0,1%	2,2%	2,5%	0,1%	2,6%	0,1%		

In this part of theory is dominantly emergence the expected and dis-preferred utterance from the guest, the variation of utterance in this theory was coming from the condition of sequence of service.

In this part of analysis has different condition, the utterance of Request that there were 27 utterances or have been stated by more than (2.7%) informant the response comes from the guest "Excuse me, may I have warm tea please and the dis-preferred responds due to "I'm sorry it was not my business" but at the reality responses was "yes, with pleasure sir/madam". "complaint" emerged from the guest and the responses comes the waiter so that the response dominantly at expected responses.

The example of this conversation took place at Kemangi restaurant, JM Hotel and Panfila Hotel when the guest said: *the food was so salty and the responses should be 'oh that not my business' as dispreferred response and there was 1 utterance or (1.0%) but in the real utterance the waiter said, Sorry sir/madam I'm going to change your food and please wait a moment' this utterance consist of 26 or (2.6%). I the next utterance is assessment 25 Utterances (2.5%) it was rise up from CA at Kemangi bar and Resto, JM Hotel, panfila hotel and melati hotel the assessment " your napkin should be on the table" and the guest utterance was "yes, thank you, yes, I know thank you, yes it was mine, those kinds of response were an expected response which contra with the theory dispreferred responses.*

The next utterance of "Assessment" comes from the supervisor to the waiter/ss it was "to my opinion your job result was not good" the given response was "I'm Sorry I'm not receive it", I did not care of that while the reality response stated that "Thak you for your advice I'll do it better" this utterance emerged 25 time of (2.5%) utterances. For the utterance was "Command" it was emerge 1 utterance with (1.0%) comes from the guest by saying "could you please take the sandwich for me, please" and the waiter responses with the expected response" Yes, sir with pleasure, ok



sir, yes sir, wait minute while the dispreferred said that "I'm sorry I need to finished my job first" "I think yes but I finished this job first".

Another utterance was "inform" they emerged in 22 times during the services or (2.5%) as an expected response or the proper expression which the waiter used to get the good atmosphere of restaurant operations. The last utterance was a "Question" this utterance appeared 19 times or (1.9%) utterances as expected utterances but the rest was 1 utterance or (1.0%) utterance as dispreferred utterance. The utterance was come from the waiter "your napkin is on the table" then the guest said yes, thank you as an expected response or the reality condition at restaurant services in the area of Kuta Mandalika Central Lombok.

DISCUSSION

The Similarities of AP above are taken from questionnaire data, the data found from other collection it was the same finding, data from audio-recording, interview, and observation tends to use the same part of utterance even all types of utterance at CA theory can be found at SOS of AP at restaurant operations. AP theory can be developed at restaurant operations not only the utterance from these theory (Grice, McCarthy and Adisty) but also can be added by the Reality utterances of restaurant and cafe operations expected and dispreferred responses.

Combining of these theories it was found that the AP at Restaurant services have a wider part of utterances rather than the theory AP the wider of result finding is most of the SOS AP have more dynamic comparing with the theories the development utterance has widely spread out than those kinds of AP theory.

The second Research Question is: are there any differences between adjacency pairs in CA and adjacency pairs at Restaurant operations by applying Sequence of services? Based on the result finding by using the data collecting methods and data analysis, adjacency pairs of Restaurant service was wider utterance function than the theory of AP so the

answer is yes, it was any differences between Adjacency Pairs of Conversational Analysis and Adjacency Pairs of SOS at Restaurant. The differences between both of them is conducting to the use of language in daily communication and daily conversation at restaurant and cafe in the area of Kuta Mandalika, those theory has different types and different component of language styles, all of them has been applied in to the SOS adjacency pairs on the restaurant area (Setting) of research.

To complete the answer of second question of this research, the researcher took data example of what kinds of utterance which has different types and utterance at restaurant operations. The data found of the differences dominantly ranked at Adisty theory as the first, second was Gricean theory and the third was McCarthy theory.

The utterances commonly emerged at Grice theory was: *Information* (Dis-preferred response) 26 Utterances or (2.6%), *Question* (Dis-preferred response) 24 Utterances or (2.4%), *Complaint* (Dis-preferred response) 22 Utterances or (2.2%), *leave-taking* (Dis-preferred response) 18 Utterances or (1.8%), *Requesting* (Dis-preferred response) 6 Utterances or (6.0%), *Greeting* (Dis-preferred response) 3 Utterances or (3.0%) and the last was an offering (Dis-preferred response) 1 Utterance or (1.0%),

Second the differences emerged at Mc.Carthy theory was: *Information* (Dis-preferred response) 24 Utterances or (2.4%), *Greeting* (Dis-preferred response) 17 Utterances or (1.7%) and one Greeting by (expected response) 1 Utterance or (1.0%), *leave-taking* (Dis-preferred response) 17 Utterances or (1.7%), *Congratulation* (Dis-preferred response) 15 Utterances or (1.5%) and one Greeting by (expected response) 1 Utterance or (1.0).

The third the differences emerged at Adisty theory was: *Requesting* (Expected response) 27 Utterances or (2.7%), *Complaint* (Expected response) 26 Utterances or (2.6%)



and *Complaint* by (Dispreferred response) 1 Utterance or (1.0%), *Command* (Expected response) 25 Utterances or (2.5%) and *command* (Dis-preferred response) 1 utterance or (1.0%) , *Assessment* (Expected response) 25 Utterances or (2.5%) and one *Assessment* by (Dis-preferred response) 1 Utterance or (1.0%), the second *Assessment* (Expected response) 25 Utterances or (2.5%) and one *Assessment* by (Dis-preferred response) 1 Utterance or (1.0%), *Informing* (Expected response) 22 Utterances or (2.2%) and *Questioning* (Expected response) 19 Utterances or (1.9%).

CONCLUSION

After conducting the research, the researcher found that a significant difference can be seen in Grice's theory which dominantly appears as much (26%) as the expressions found in several restaurants in Kuta Madalika then McCarthy's theory is dominantly used (24%) and Adisty (0.1%) is dominantly used, the rest is used in the form of expected expressions and relevant with the existing theory.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adisty, F et. all., 2012, *A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in the Classroom Scenes of Freedom Writers the movie*, [http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Suzy Bills](http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Suzy_Bills).
- [2] Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. 1998. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [3] Fromkin, Victoria., Rodman, Robert., and Hyams, Nina. 2011. *An Introduction to Language*. Ninth Edition. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- [4] Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies In the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [5] McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

- [6] Paltridge, B, 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*, Australia, AEE Publishing.
- [7] Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. 1973. *Opening and Closing in Semiotica*, Vol. 8, pp. 289-327.
- [8] Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E. 1979. *Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and their Interactions in Psathas, G. (ed.)*. *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, New York, Irvington Press.



HALAMAN INI SENGAJA DIKOSONGKAN