

Conversation Analysis in the Podcast Featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura

Yohanes Mala Nahas^{*1}, I Gusti Ngurah Adi Rajistha¹, Ni Wayan Kasni¹

1. Faculty of Letters, Universitas Warmadewa, Indonesia

^{*}Corresponding author: yohanesmalanahas@gmail.com

Abstract. Conversation is an essential component of everyday communication, acting as the main means of establishing social bonds and expressing meaning in a variety of communicative circumstances. In a conversation patterns and structures are crucial for structuring speech, directing responses, and maintaining a fluid communication flow during a conversation. The study focuses on identifying conversational patterns and structures that emerge throughout the interaction. The research employs the theory of Conversation Analysis (CA) by Jack Sidnell (2010) to analyze conversational patterns and the theory of interactional structure by Paul Ten Have (2007) to examine structural organization. The data were collected from the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura and analyzed using a qualitative descriptive method. The analysis categorized the conversational features into reference, repair, repetition, and adjacency pairs under conversational patterns, and turn-taking organization and sequence organization under structural interactional organization. The findings indicate that all identified conversational patterns appeared in the podcast, while only two structural interactional elements turn-taking organization and sequence organization were found, with turn-taking organization being the dominant structure. This study contributes to the field of discourse analysis by providing insights into how turn-taking mechanisms and conversational preferences shape interactions in podcast discussions.

Keywords: Conversation analysis; discourse analysis; turn-taking; podcast; preference

1. Introduction

The process of exchanging thoughts, feelings, and information between two or more people is called communication, and it is sometimes referred to as conversation. The main purpose of communication is to convey a message clearly and effectively so that it can be understood by the receiver. In a conversation, misunderstandings between interlocutors often arise due to unclear messages being conveyed. In this communication process, a variety of methods are used, including the use of spoken language, writing, gestures, or even electronic media, to communicate and interact with others.

The basis of conversation is communication, which can be seen in the process of concrete interaction between individuals or groups in a conversation. Discourse analysis, which looks at how participants in a discussion develop and interpret messages, ideas, and meanings, puts the conversation front and center. Conversation becomes the main focus in discourse analysis. In discourse analysis, the relationship between language use and conversation is very close. Conversation is a key concept in discourse analysis that refers to specific interaction pattern and adjacency pairs are one of the notions. The function of adjacency pairs itself is to create a framework in conversation, help conversation participants to understand their roles, and keep the interaction smooth.

Several research have already looked into conversation analysis, most of them concentrating on the study of dialogues or even interviews. The results demonstrate that therapist repetitions in open

dialogue have several purposes, such as initiating repairs, indicating receipt, and asking for further details and repeats have a nuanced purpose that goes beyond what open dialogue literature initially suggests since they are selective and gently steer the conversation, even though they can invite elaboration (Ong et al., 2024). Summarizing multi-participant conversations often analyzed in conversation analysis, can be used as a tool for knowledge discovery and reusable information extraction in organizations (Kosilova & Birzniece, 2024). Discourse markers, backchannels, adjacency pairs, and repetition are vital tactics that facilitate successful communication in multilingual and multicultural talks, assisting speakers from various linguistic backgrounds and geographical locations in navigating and maintaining successful interactions, according to studies (Urooj, 2024). According to the report, conversation analysis (CA) is becoming more and more crucial for gleaning insights from conversation logs; nevertheless, in order to better serve commercial applications, the fragmented methods now in use need to be systematized (Zhang et al., 2023).

This research holds significant importance in understanding the dynamics of conversation within digital media, particularly podcasts. It provides new insights into how verbal interactions evolve in a more contemporary and dynamic context. In analyzing the conversation in the podcast between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura, this study offers novelty by focusing on conversational analysis within the context of digital media, specifically podcasts, which have not been explored in depth in previous studies. Additionally, this study is crucial as it expands the scope of conversation analysis into a medium that is increasingly popular yet underexplored podcasts. As a result, this research can contribute to the development of discourse analysis theories, especially in understanding how interactions occur on informal yet impactful digital platforms. Moreover, the study offers practical implications for language and communication learning, highlighting the need to adapt communication strategies in an ever-evolving digital environment. this research will discuss and analyze conversation within the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura. The following are the scope of discussion of this research:

- What are the conversational patterns emerge in the podcast conversation featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura?
- How is the conversational structure organized in the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura?

Analyzing conversation in podcasts is highly interesting because podcasts are a contemporary and rapidly evolving communication medium. Communication within podcasts involves not just verbal interactions but also reflects the patterns and characteristics unique to digital platforms. Therefore, this research will further explore how conversations unfold in the context of podcasts, particularly focusing on the interactions between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura.

2. Method

Methods are one of the most important parts of research. This is because every research must be based on methods that aim to answer research questions and achieve research objectives. In this research, the method used is a qualitative method, which consists of data source, data collection and data analysis.

The main data source for this study was the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura. The form of the data was the dialogue transcriptions derived from this podcast. These transcriptions served as the primary material for analysis, allowing for the investigation of conversational elements such as preference, adjacency pairs, turn-taking, and sequence organization.

The data collection began with carefully listening to and watching the podcast to identify relevant conversational passages. Selected dialogues were then transcribed in detail, capturing the relevant conversational patterns such as preference, adjacency pairs, and repetition, while also identifying the conversational structure. Finally, the transcribed data was systematically organized for further analysis, ensuring a structured and thorough examination.

This study employed a qualitative approach to analyze conversational patterns in the podcast

featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura. The analysis began by identifying patterns in the transcribed dialogues, categorizing them into conversational structures such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and sequence organization. This process aimed to systematically interpret these patterns and relate the findings to the applied theories.

3. Discussion

The data used in this study were obtained from the podcast titled "Lack of Critical Thinking Skills in Indonesian Society", published on YouTube. This podcast features a conversation between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura, discussing various issues related to the lack of critical thinking skills in Indonesian society. This podcast was selected based on its relevance to the research aim, which is to analyze the structure and patterns of the conversation.

The data were analyzed based on Conversation Analysis (CA) theory as presented by Paul Ten Have and Jack Sidnell. Conversations are structured into several key elements such as opening, turn-taking, adjacency pairs, pauses, interruptions, topic shifts, and closing (Ten Have, 2007). Conversation analysis is a method for studying how people interact in everyday conversation, focusing on the patterns of organization in talk. It seeks to understand how conversational actions such as asking, answering, offering, and requesting are systematically arranged and coordinated by participants in interaction (Sidnell, 2010).

These elements are fundamental components in understanding how meaning is constructed in social interactions. In this study, Ten Have's theory is applied to identify and analyze how conversational structure emerge within the dialogue between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura, while Sidnell's theory is used to explain the patterns in detail. The following discussion will elaborate on the analysis of the conversational structure in the podcast, including the interaction patterns that emerged during their discussion.



Picture 1. Podcast on YouTube Channel

Conversational Analysis

Conversational patterns refer to the recurring structures and sequences in verbal interactions that shape how communication flows between speakers. These patterns determine how speakers take turns, respond to each other, and manage the progression of a conversation. Meanwhile, conversational structure refers to the underlying organization that governs interactions, such as turn-taking and the sequencing of speech.

In this study, the analysis of the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura will focus on identifying various conversational patterns, including preference, adjacency pairs, repair, and repetition. Additionally, this section will examine the conversational structure observed in the podcast, specifically turn-taking and sequence organization, to understand how these elements contribute to maintaining a coherent and engaging dialogue.

Preference

The conversation between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura in the podcast features various patterns, including preferred and dispreferred responses. A preferred response occurs when the given response aligns with the expectation set by the previous question or statement, while a dispreferred response appears when the response does not meet the expectation or includes hesitation, rejection, or modification. Preferred responses in this conversation tend to be direct, concise, and without delay, whereas dispreferred responses show signs of uncertainty before answering. The following is an analysis of example of preferred and dispreferred responses found in the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura.

The following is an analysis of several examples of preferred-dispreferred and action based preference responses found in the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura.

1) Cinta : [*“And that will prevent you from being misled by certain religious leaders who want you to believe what they believe. You know what I mean?”*]

Indah : [*“Hmm... right.”*]

Cinta : [*“Yeah, this is so interesting.”*]

This exchange occurs at 33:11 in the podcast, during a discussion on Indonesia’s education system and its heavy reliance on rote memorization. Cinta underscores the broader implications of this learning approach, suggesting that an overemphasis on memorization, rather than critical thinking, can leave individuals more vulnerable to unquestioningly accepting authoritative views. She specifically points out how this dynamic may allow certain religious leaders to influence followers without scrutiny. Indah responds with a thoughtful acknowledgment, indicating her agreement and engagement with the topic. The conversation reflects their shared concern about the need for a more analytical mindset in education and everyday decision-making.

The dialogue reflects preferred response, as Indah’s response (*“Hmm... right”*) immediately aligns with Cinta’s statement, reinforcing agreement and attentiveness. The use of (*“Hmm...”*) functions as a minimal response, signaling active listening and cognitive processing, while (*“right”*) serves as an explicit affirmation of Cinta’s point. This pattern of agreement fosters a cooperative conversational dynamic, where Indah’s acknowledgment encourages Cinta to elaborate further without interruption. Cinta’s follow-up remark (*“Yeah, this is so interesting”*) extends the interaction, emphasizing engagement and mutual interest in the topic. The seamless progression of turns demonstrates a conversational pattern in which speakers actively validate each other’s statements, reinforcing a shared understanding and maintaining the rhythm of discussion.

From a structural perspective, this interaction demonstrates smooth turn-taking without significant pauses or disruptions. Indah’s brief yet affirmative response acts as a cue for Cinta to elaborate further, reinforcing their shared perspective on the topic. The overlapping nature of their contributions, where Indah provides subtle feedback before Cinta resumes speaking, exemplifies cooperative conversation management. This fluid exchange keeps the discussion engaging and interactive, illustrating how concurrent preference facilitates effective communication.

2) Indah : [*“This is where critical thinking comes in. Notice how I said correlation, not causation, and a lot of people tend to conflate that.”*]

Cinta : [*“And that’s why I said correlational.”*]

This conversation takes place at 37:58, when Indah discusses the growing awareness of critical thinking in Indonesia. She emphasizes the distinction between correlation and causation, pointing out how people often misinterpret relationships between variables. Indah highlights the importance of analytical reasoning in evaluating information to avoid drawing misleading conclusions.

The dialogue represents a preferred response, as Cinta’s reply seamlessly aligns with Indah’s statement, reinforcing agreement while simultaneously elaborating on the point being discussed. By stating, **“And that’s why I said correlational,”** Cinta not only validates Indah’s emphasis on the distinction

between correlation and causation but also demonstrates attentiveness to the conversation. The use of **“and”** at the beginning of her response indicates an additive function, ensuring continuity and coherence in the exchange. This preferred response contributes to a collaborative conversational style, where both speakers actively support and build upon each other’s ideas. The absence of hesitation or contradiction further emphasizes mutual understanding, maintaining a fluid and cooperative dialogue structure.

From a structural standpoint, this conversation demonstrates smooth turn-taking. Cinta expands on Indah’s statement without disrupting the flow of conversation, as her response naturally follows from the preceding turn. This interaction also highlights mutual participation, where both speakers actively engage in meaning-making. In conversation analysis, a preferred response is characterized by an immediate and supportive alignment with the preceding statement, as seen in this exchange. The lack of delay or mitigation further underscores the cooperative nature of the dialogue, reinforcing shared understanding between the speakers.

3) Indah : [*“Have you been back since you graduated?”*]

Cinta : [*“Umm... once hahah... wait, before you ask me this first question, can I just say what’s so funny is?”*]

Indah : [*“Yem... go ahead!”*]

Cinta : [*“I think it’s kind of ironic we talk about minorities a lot, but I feel like in this country, there’s actually a lot of a silent majority.”*]

This dialogue occurs at 13:05 in the podcast when Indah and Cinta discuss the concept of a silent majority and its potential dangers. Indah initially asks Cinta whether she has returned to Indonesia since graduating, but before directly addressing the question, Cinta redirects the conversation to a topic she finds more pressing. She laughs, hesitates momentarily, and then introduces her thoughts on the silent majority, highlighting its irony in the broader discussion of social issues in Indonesia.

This exchange is an excellent example of action-based preference from the standpoint of conversational patterns. In response to Indah's question, Cinta first gives a succinct, expected response (*“Umm... once hahah...”*) that is consistent with the desired response. But instead of going into further detail, she abruptly changes the topic of discussion by saying, (*“Wait, before you ask me this first question, can I just say what’s so funny is?”*). Because Cinta actively reroutes the conversation to a different subject she believes is more pertinent, this change exemplifies action-based preference. She demonstrates conversational agency by taking the initiative to change the discussion rather than passively replying within the expected adjacency pair structure. Indah’s response, (*“Yem... go ahead!”*), signals acceptance of this shift, reinforcing the cooperative nature of the exchange. This interaction highlights how action-based preference allows speakers to steer the conversation while still maintaining social harmony.

Turn-taking organization is evident in this instance from the standpoint of interactional structure. A transition relevance place (TRP) is created by Indah's opening query, giving Cinta a chance to reply. Cinta, however, uses self-selection to take charge of the discussion and offer an alternative viewpoint rather than responding to the question in its entirety. Before changing the subject, there is a little pause and a laugh (*“Umm... once hahah...”*), which suggests an attempt to make the changeover go smoothly without coming across as condescending. When Indah notices this change, he quickly gives Cinta the opportunity with a helpful reply, guaranteeing that the conversation follows naturally. Action-based preference promotes conversational dynamism by allowing speakers to meaningfully affect debates while maintaining interactional balance, as demonstrated in this exchange.

The preference analysis of the podcast conversation demonstrates how speakers skillfully handle disagreement, agreement, and conversational shifts to preserve a cordial and collaborative exchange. The dynamics of interactions are shaped by preferred and dispreferred response, with speakers avoiding potentially embarrassing behaviors by employing techniques like softeners, explanations, or reluctance. Action-based preference also shows how presenters actively direct conversations toward pertinent subjects while maintaining turn-taking consistency. These patterns highlight the significance of conversational coherence, civility, and interaction, reflecting not only linguistic structures but also the

social and cognitive processes required in effective communication.

Repair

Misunderstandings, speech mistakes, or ambiguous utterances frequently arise in casual conversation, necessitating the use of repair mechanisms to keep the exchange flowing. The process by which speakers correct themselves, make meaning clearer, or address communication breakdowns is referred to as repair. Conversation Analysis (CA) divides repair into two categories: self-initiated self-repair, in which the speaker fixes their own error, and other-initiated repair, in which the listener asks for clarification. Different repair sequences can be seen when Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura negotiate difficult conversations in the podcast.

1) Indah : [*“Wherever we talk in English, we prioritize the precision of like retelling like for example, a certain story, making sure that like you really get like... all of the details in there and then with Indonesians, it’s usually like....”*]

Cinta : (*interrupting and completing the thought*) [*“You scratch the surface”*]

Indah : [*“Yeah”*]

Cinta : [*“My Indonesian has gotten exponentially better over the course of the last four or five years.”*]

Indah and Cinta talk about the distinctions between Indonesian and English communication styles in this interaction, which takes place at 4:25 in the podcast. Indah tries to clarify how English people emphasize accuracy in narrative, but she falters and finds it difficult to finish her sentence. Cinta interjects and finishes the sentence at this point, demonstrating an other-repair process where the listener fills in the blanks or rephrases the speaker's incomplete message.

This conversation exemplifies repair, particularly collaborative completion, where one speaker assists the other in articulating a thought before they fully express it. Indah begins formulating an idea about how English speakers prioritize precision in storytelling compared to Indonesians, but she hesitates and trails off (*“it’s usually like...”*), leaving the thought unfinished. Cinta then steps in, interrupting with (*“You scratch the surface,”*) effectively completing Indah’s statement in a way that aligns with her intended meaning. This demonstrates a shared understanding between the speakers, as Cinta anticipates Indah’s point and provides the necessary phrasing to maintain the conversational flow. Indah’s immediate affirmation (*“Yeah”*) confirms that Cinta’s completion is accurate, reinforcing their alignment in thought. Following this, Cinta seamlessly shifts to a related topic her own improvement in Indonesian without breaking the rhythm of the conversation. This smooth transition further highlights their cooperative interaction, where interruptions are not disruptive but rather contribute to a fluid and collaborative discussion.

This instance also demonstrates turn-taking processes from the standpoint of interactional structure, as Cinta takes over the turn before Indah finishes her phrase. In spite of this, Indah doesn't object or try to take back her turn; instead, she says, *“Yeah,”* indicating that Cinta's interpretation is in line with what she was attempting to say. High conversational alignment is demonstrated by the seamless transitions between turns, which support the organic flow of their discourse.

This illustration highlights the role of repair mechanisms, particularly other-initiated repair, in enhancing communication clarity. Cinta’s interruption serves as a cooperative effort rather than a disruption, demonstrating how speakers can actively assist one another in constructing meaning. By stepping in before Indah completes her phrase, Cinta refines the message in real time, ensuring that the intended idea is conveyed more effectively. Indah’s immediate agreement (*“Yeah”*) reinforces the notion that such interruptions, when aligned with the speaker’s intent, contribute to a more fluid and cohesive conversation. This exchange exemplifies the collaborative nature of dialogue, where speakers work together to shape and refine their discourse. Moreover, it highlights the importance of shared understanding in maintaining conversational coherence, as both participants exhibit a strong level of attunement to each other’s thoughts and communicative styles.

2) Indah : [*"I think it is fair to say people like you and me, we have the room to be able to critically think because we're not so busy worrying about all the other things like basic necessities, Maslow's hierarchy of needs, very bottom."*]

Cinta : [*"You know, I don't think it's fair to attribute our lack of critical thinking solely to our economic condition."*]

Indah : [*"Not to attribute that to solely that, but it's like how that is a factor."*]

Cinta : [*"Yeah, that is definitely a factor. But I think what exacerbates that in our country is that we're an archipelago."*]

This exchange occurs at 20:10 in the podcast when Indah and Cinta discuss the factors influencing critical thinking, particularly in relation to economic conditions and Indonesia's geographical structure. Indah initially argues that individuals like her and Cinta, who do not struggle with basic necessities, have more space to engage in critical thinking. She references Maslow's hierarchy of needs to support her point. However, Cinta challenges this perspective by asserting that economic conditions should not be the sole determinant of critical thinking.

The key moment in this dialogue that demonstrates self-initiated self-repair occurs when Indah immediately revises her statement after Cinta's response. Initially, her statement (*"we have the room to be able to critically think because we're not so busy worrying about all the other things"*) implies a direct correlation between economic security and critical thinking. Cinta's challenge highlights a possible misinterpretation that Indah is attributing a lack of critical thinking entirely to economic struggles. Recognizing this, Indah quickly corrects herself with (*"Not to attribute that to solely that, but it's like how that is a factor"*). This revision ensures that her argument is not misunderstood and clarifies that economic conditions are just one of many factors influencing critical thinking.

This interaction exemplifies self-repair, as Indah takes the initiative to refine her statement without external prompting. Instead of allowing the conversation to proceed with ambiguity, she proactively adjusts her wording to maintain accuracy and prevent miscommunication. Cinta's immediate response (*"Yeah, that is definitely a factor"*) signals that she acknowledges and accepts Indah's clarification, reinforcing alignment in their discussion.

From an interactional structure perspective, this exchange also reflects effective turn-taking. Indah completes her initial statement at a transition relevance place (TRP), allowing Cinta to challenge her point. However, rather than engaging in prolonged disagreement, Indah quickly self-repairs, which allows the conversation to progress smoothly. This instance highlights how repair functions as a crucial mechanism in maintaining clarity, avoiding misinterpretation, and fostering cooperative dialogue.

Repetition

A typical conversational technique that aids in emphasizing important points, elucidating concepts, and guaranteeing mutual understanding is repetition. Repetition is sometimes employed to strengthen consensus, while other times it gives speakers time to gather their views. Repetition appears in a number of ways throughout the podcast exchange between Cinta Laura and Indah Gunawan, adding to the discussion's rhythm and coherence. The analysis that follows looks at situations where repetition takes place and how it affects how they interact.

1) Indah : [*"Being brutally, brutally honest because like..."*]

Cinta : [*"Absolutely."*]

Indah : [*"I... I think... I'm... I'm... I'm going to guess that there's going to be a lot of clicks on this episode, not just because like obviously it's with you, but I think... it's also because this is a conversation that a lot of people care about."*]

At 12:14 in the podcast, Indah and Cinta have a conversation on their divergent viewpoints, which have been influenced by their experiences living overseas. The discussion is on how exposure to diverse cultures shapes their perspectives, frequently resulting in divergent views from those of people who have lived in Indonesia their entire lives. Because of the themes' complexity and significance, Indah expects

their debate to strike a chord with a large number of listeners.

Repetition in this segment appears in multiple forms. Indah's deliberate repetition of (*"brutally, brutally"*) reinforces the intensity of her statement, emphasizing the importance of honesty in their discussion. This form of lexical repetition is often used to strengthen a speaker's conviction and ensure that the message is received with the intended emphasis. Additionally, her stammering (*"I... I think... I'm... I'm... I'm going to guess..."*) reflects a moment of cognitive processing, where she is organizing her thoughts in real time. This self-repair mechanism is common in spontaneous speech, particularly when a speaker is formulating an idea while maintaining conversational engagement. Rather than disrupting the flow, this repetition adds authenticity to the dialogue, mirroring natural speech patterns where speakers often hesitate or reformulate their statements to achieve clarity. Furthermore, Cinta's immediate and decisive response (*"Absolutely"*) contrasts with Indah's hesitations, serving as an affirmation that keeps the conversation moving smoothly. This interplay between hesitation and affirmation contributes to a dynamic and cooperative conversational rhythm.

This dialogue exemplifies a turn-taking organization. Cinta's brief yet affirmative response, *"Absolutely,"* serves as a minimal response that acknowledges Indah's statement without disrupting the flow of conversation. This interaction demonstrates smooth turn-taking, where Cinta provides verbal support while allowing Indah to maintain her speaking turn. The absence of overlap and the structured progression of turns highlight a cooperative exchange, ensuring that both speakers contribute to the discussion while preserving conversational coherence.

2) Indah : [*"Do you want to read the comments?"*]

Cinta : [*"I'd rather not, because i just get so angry"*]

Indah: [*"okay! And i was like...one of a lot of the comment were basically...a lot of the comments i can't tell the difference between us in factuality being a Muslim majority country versus us being a Muslim country"*]

Cinta : [*"Yeah"*]

At 39:49 in the podcast, Indah and Cinta discuss public reactions to a social media post made by an Indonesian football player. The conversation highlights how people interpret religious identity in Indonesia and how public perception influences online discourse. Cinta expresses frustration about reading online comments, while Indah attempts to summarize the general sentiment she observed.

Repetition appears in multiple forms throughout this segment. Indah's phrase (*"one of a lot of the comments were basically... a lot of the comments"*) demonstrates self-repair and reformulation. She initially starts with (*"one of a lot of the comments"*) before restructuring her sentence to clarify her point. This type of repetition is common in spontaneous speech when a speaker is organizing their thoughts in real time. The phrase (*"a lot of the comments"*) is repeated, reinforcing the overwhelming number of reactions she encountered. Additionally, Indah contrasts two closely related idea (*"us in factuality being a Muslim majority country" versus "us being a Muslim country."*) The near-repetition of the phrase (*"Muslim country"*) with slight modification serves to emphasize the distinction between Indonesia's religious demographics and its official status as a secular state. This parallel structure highlights Indah's attempt to articulate the nuanced difference, making it clearer for both Cinta and the audience.

Cinta's brief response (*"Yeah"*) functions as a minimal response that acknowledges Indah's point without interrupting the conversation. This keeps the dialogue flowing while subtly reinforcing agreement. The interplay of repetition and hesitation in Indah's speech, contrasted with Cinta's succinct acknowledgment, mirrors natural conversational rhythms where speakers clarify and reinforce key points through repetition.

Structurally, this interaction aligns with a turn-taking organization. Indah dominates the speaking turn, using repetition as a means of structuring her thoughts, while Cinta's brief response marks a smooth transition in the exchange. The absence of overlap ensures clarity, allowing Indah to fully express her argument before moving forward in the discussion.

Adjacency Pairs

In conversation analysis, adjacency pairs refer to sequences of two related utterances produced by different speakers, where the first part sets up an expectation for a particular type of response. In the podcast between Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura, adjacency pairs frequently appear as they exchange thoughts, seek confirmation, and provide responses to each other's statements. These exchanges demonstrate how their conversation is collaboratively structured, with each turn naturally prompting the next. The following analysis explores instances of adjacency pairs found in their discussion.

1) Cinta : ["When I move from Germany to Indonesia, I actually struggled in school because I didn't speak English very fluently at the time"]

Indah : ["When did you move here?"]

Cinta : ["When I was eleven"]

This dialogue occurs at 0:24 in the podcast, at the beginning of the conversation between Indah and Cinta. Indah asks about Cinta's personal experience of moving to a new place. The context centers around Indah's curiosity about Cinta's background, particularly the specific time she moved.

This discussion exemplifies a typical question-answer adjacency pair, which is a basic dialogue structure from the perspective of conversational patterns. Cinta opens the conversation by sharing a personal story about how, after moving from Germany to Indonesia, she struggled in school because of linguistic barriers. This opening statement acts as a pre-expansion, providing background information for Indah's subsequent contributions to the discussion. Indah starts a question-answer series by requesting precise facts, rather than offering a remark or commentary in response (*"When did you move here?"*). Cinta must respond to this inquiry, which serves as the adjacency pair's first pair part. Cinta then provides a direct and expected answer (*"When I was eleven."*). This response serves as the second pair part and aligns with the preferred response format since it directly addresses the inquiry without hesitation or elaboration. The exchange exemplifies how adjacency pairs function to maintain conversational coherence, as the question naturally elicits an informative response, allowing the dialogue to flow smoothly.

Additionally, this exchange illustrates a sequentially organized interaction, where Indah's question serves as a first-pair part, and Cinta's response acts as a second-pair part. The interaction follows a smooth and structured conversational flow, ensuring coherence. The brevity of Cinta's answer suggests a straightforward exchange without hesitation or elaboration, reinforcing the efficiency of adjacency pairs in everyday conversation.

2) Indah : ["Other people that also stems a lot from lack of critical thinking skills and also just y'all forget that this is a country built on like the principles of Bhineka Tunggal Ika."]

Cinta : ["Yeah, exactly."]

Indah : ["Yeah. It's not just for the majority."]

Cinta : ["Yeah, but... can I say something?"]

Indah : ["Yup... sure."]

This exchange occurs at 40:57 in the podcast when Indah and Cinta discuss critical thinking, particularly regarding misconceptions about Indonesia's identity as a religious state. Indah highlights how a lack of critical thinking contributes to misinterpretations of the country's founding principles, emphasizing the importance of diversity. Cinta initially signals agreement with Indah's point but then seeks an opportunity to add her own perspective, shifting the direction of the discussion.

From a conversational pattern perspective, this dialogue represents request-compliance, a fundamental type of adjacency pair. Cinta's utterance, (*"But... can I say something?"*), functions as a request to take the next turn and introduce her own perspective into the discussion. Rather than directly interrupting Indah's statement, Cinta frames her contribution as a polite inquiry, which serves to maintain the cooperative nature of the conversation. This strategy reflects an awareness of conversational

norms, as she ensures that her transition into speaking is acknowledged rather than imposed. Indah's response, *("Yup... sure.")*, represents compliance, demonstrating an acceptance of Cinta's request. This compliance is immediate and affirmative, signaling an openness to Cinta's forthcoming statement without hesitation or resistance. The seamless exchange between request and compliance highlights how adjacency pairs function to regulate conversational flow, preventing disruptions while allowing both participants to actively engage. Furthermore, this interaction reinforces mutual respect between the speakers, as Cinta seeks permission before contributing, and Indah readily accommodates her request. By structuring their interaction in this manner, the conversation maintains an orderly progression, with both speakers balancing their contributions effectively.

This conversation illustrates turn-taking organization and insert expansion from a structural perspective. Cinta's utterance *("But... can I say something?")* serves as a turn-allocating move, where she signals her intention to take the floor without interrupting Indah's speaking turn. Instead of directly introducing a new idea, she strategically inserts an expansion a brief request for permission before proceeding with her point. Indah's immediate response *("Yup... sure")* functions as a compliance move, facilitating a smooth transition in speaker roles. Structurally, this interaction demonstrates how speakers manage conversational flow through explicit turn negotiation, ensuring coherence and mutual engagement in discussion. The use of insert expansion here adds a layer of politeness and conversational coordination, reinforcing an orderly and cooperative exchange between speakers. pair showcases how speakers strategically manage participation, ensuring that contributions are smoothly integrated into the ongoing discussion.

4. Conclusion

This research has analyzed the conversational patterns and interactional structures in the podcast featuring Indah Gunawan and Cinta Laura using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). The findings reveal that all identified patterns, such as preference, repair, repetition, and adjacency pairs, are present in the conversation. These patterns indicate that the dialogue is structured in a way that facilitates smooth interaction and mutual understanding between the speakers.

In terms of interactional organization, the analysis shows that two main structures are present in the conversation: turn-taking organization and sequence organization. Among these, turn-taking organization is the most dominant, demonstrating a well managed exchange of turns with minimal interruptions and overlaps. The presence of sequence organization further supports the structured nature of the interaction, ensuring that responses remain relevant and coherent within the conversational flow.

Through an analysis of conversational patterns and structures, this study offers a greater understanding of the factors influencing successful communication. These findings can be used to a variety of spoken interaction scenarios, including debates, interviews, and everyday conversation, and they further the area of discourse analysis.

References

- Kosilova, K., & Birzniece, I. (2024). Survey on Organizational Chat Conversation Analysis: Exploring Dialogue Summarization from a Knowledge Discovery Perspective. 39, 86–104.
- Ong, B., Barnes, S., & Buus, N. (2024). A conversation analysis of therapist repeats in open dialogue network meetings. January 2023, 113–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12852>
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*.
- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Partical Guide (Second edi)*. SAGE Publications.
- Urooj, Y. (2024). Review Of Law And Social Sciences Issn (O): 3078-1574 The Dynamics of Conversation : Uncovering Key Communication Strategies. 2(2), 27–38.
- Zhang, X., Yu, H., Li, Y., Wang, M., Chen, L., Huang, F., & Group, A. (2023). The Imperative of Conversation Analysis in the Era of LLMs : A Survey of Tasks, Techniques, and Trends.