



Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in the Conversations of the Movie Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse

I Putu Yona Vananda¹, Ni Wayan Kasni^{2*}, Made Sani Damayanthi Muliawan³

¹⁻³ Faculty of English Literature, Universitas Warmadewa, Denpasar 80239, Indonesia
Email: vanandayona@gmail.com, wayankasni@gmail.com, muliawansanidama@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 29 Dec 2025	This study examines adjacency pairs in the conversations of the animated movie Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse (2018). The study focuses on identifying the types of adjacency pairs and explaining their interactional functions in the dialogue. This research applies a descriptive qualitative method using movie dialogue and official script as data sources. Data were collected through observation and note-taking and analyzed using Conversation Analysis by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), Preference Organization by Levinson, and discourse analysis by Paltridge (2012). The findings show ten adjacency pair types, namely question-answer, request-acceptance, request-refusal, assessment-agreement, assessment-disagreement, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance, offer-refusal, apology-acceptance, and compliment-acceptance. The question-answer pattern appeared most dominantly because many interactions demanded clarification from Miles. Adjacency pairs not only regulate the order of conversation but also indicate power relations and emotional states. The results indicate that adjacency pairs organize turn-taking, reveal power relations, express emotional pressure, and support character development. Miles Morales appears as a reactive participant who gradually becomes confident and independent through interaction patterns. Changes in response patterns indicate character development. Miles initially avoids, gives minimal answers, and uses indirect refusals. As the story progresses, he gives acceptance, agreement, and clearer responses. Nonverbal responses such as silence, nods, and facial expressions also function as part of the conversation pair and reinforce the meaning of the interaction. The study concludes that adjacency pairs function as a linguistic mechanism shaping conversational flow and narrative meaning in animated movie dialogue.
Accepted: 16 Feb 2026	
Published: 08 Apr 2026	
Keywords: Adjacency pairs, Conversation analysis, Discourse analysis	
Doi: https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.5.1.2026.106-121	

*Corresponding Author
E-mail: wayankasni@gmail.com
Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)
CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License

1. Introduction

Conversations are composed of a series of interrelated social actions that are systematically organized to maintain mutual understanding and interactional coherence (Kasni & Budiarta, 2025). One of the central mechanisms in conversational organization is the concept of adjacency pairs, namely two sequential utterances that are interdependent, such as question–answer, request–acceptance, greeting–greeting, or compliment–response patterns. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) argued that adjacency pairs constitute the basic structural unit of conversation because the production of a first pair part creates normative expectations for a relevant second pair part. This sequential organization regulates the flow of interaction and shapes how speakers negotiate meaning, agreement, rejection, or conflict within communication. Furthermore, Levinson (1983) emphasized that responses in adjacency pairs may occur as preferred or dispreferred actions, reflecting levels of cooperation, solidarity, hesitation, or resistance between interlocutors. Similarly, Yule (1996) highlighted that adjacency pairs play a crucial role in maintaining smooth turn-taking and ensuring conversational continuity. These perspectives demonstrate that adjacency pairs should not merely be understood as mechanical patterns of exchange, but as interactional resources through which speakers construct social relationships, negotiate authority, and express identity within discourse.

Research on adjacency pairs has been widely conducted in various communicative settings, including everyday conversations, television talk shows, dramas, and films. Permatasari and Listiyanti (2017) identified the dominance of question–answer sequences in drama dialogues, indicating the importance of information exchange in scripted interaction. In addition, the question–answer and compliment–acceptance pairs contribute significantly to maintaining the smoothness of public interaction (Khalaf & Sameer, 2023; Latifah & Gunawan, 2024; Marsella et al., 2023; Nurhayati et al., 2020; Pardede & Silalahi, 2020). Meanwhile Iswara (2019) revealed that response strategies are strongly influenced by politeness and social relations between speakers. In addition, recent studies have begun to explore adjacency pairs in animated movies. Maulidia and Rosyidah (2024) identified 110 adjacency pairs in animated films, with question–answer patterns appearing most frequently, whereas Negara and Sedeng (2024) reported the existence of 16 types of speech pairs with preferred responses dominating the interactions. Despite these contributions, previous studies remain largely descriptive because they primarily emphasize the classification and frequency of adjacency pairs without critically examining their deeper interactional significance. As a result, adjacency pairs are often treated as isolated linguistic forms rather than as dynamic conversational strategies that shape characterization, ideology, emotional tension, and power negotiation within cinematic discourse (Bintana et al., 2018; Fatimah et al., 2025; Rahmawati et al., 2021; Trihartanti & Septiyan, 2021).

Another important limitation lies in the object of analysis. Most previous studies focus on ordinary dramas or general animated films, while multiverse superhero movies remain substantially underexplored within conversation analysis research. This gap is significant because multiverse narratives present highly complex interactions involving

characters from different dimensions, cultural backgrounds, social hierarchies, and communicative styles. Such complexity potentially produces more dynamic adjacency pair patterns, particularly in relation to conflict, authority, resistance, and identity construction. Furthermore, earlier studies rarely integrate conversation analysis with preference organization and discourse analysis simultaneously, resulting in limited interpretation of how conversational structures contribute to broader social meanings in film narratives. Consequently, existing scholarship has not sufficiently explained how adjacency pairs function as discursive mechanisms for constructing power relations and character identity in contemporary animated superhero cinema.

The animated movie *Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse* provides a compelling context for addressing these limitations because the film presents fast-paced, emotionally layered, and culturally diverse interactions among characters originating from different universes. According to Cutting (2002), movie dialogues are intentionally designed to resemble natural conversation, making films highly relevant objects for pragmatic and discourse analysis. However, the conversational complexity of multiverse films extends beyond ordinary scripted interaction because characters frequently negotiate unfamiliar identities, competing authority, intergenerational tensions, and conflicting moral perspectives. These interactional dynamics create rich conversational data that can reveal how adjacency pairs function not only to maintain conversational flow but also to construct dominance, solidarity, resistance, and emotional alignment between characters. Despite the increasing popularity of multiverse superhero films in contemporary popular culture, studies investigating adjacency pairs within this genre remain scarce, particularly those that critically examine the relationship between conversational structure and interactional meaning (Isgianto, 1983; Putri & Rahayu, 2022; Setiani et al., 2025; Umami et al., 2023).

Based on these gaps, this study aims to investigate the types of adjacency pairs appearing in *Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse* and to analyze how these conversational patterns construct interactional meanings, character identities, and power relations within the film. Specifically, this research seeks to move beyond mere classification by integrating conversation analysis, preference organization, and discourse analysis to explain the social and pragmatic functions of adjacency pairs in multiverse cinematic discourse.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 *Conversation Analysis*

Conversation analysis views conversation as a socially organized sequential action. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) explained that interactions do not occur randomly, but follow certain patterns that can be observed through the structure of turn-taking. One of the main units in conversation analysis is adjacency pairs. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) stated that adjacency pairs consist of two utterances that appear sequentially, are produced by different speakers, and are functionally dependent on each other. The first utterance is

called the First Pair Part (FPP), while the second utterance is called the Second Pair Part (SPP). The FPP projects a specific response as the next relevant action.

2.2 Preference Organization

In addition to speech pair structures, this study uses Preference Organization theory to explain response forms in adjacency pairs. Levinson (1983) explained that responses in speech pairs are divided into preferred and dispreferred responses. Preferred responses are socially expected responses that support the continuation of interaction, such as acceptance, agreement, or direct answers. Conversely, dispreferred responses reflect rejection, disagreement, or responses that threaten the harmony of interaction.

Levinson (1983) asserted that dispreferred responses are often marked by pauses, additional reasons, indirect forms, or mitigation strategies. This pattern shows that the structure of conversation is not neutral, but reflects the level of cooperation, conflict, or social tension. Through this theory, research can identify how characters in movies choose certain responses and how those choices reflect power relations, solidarity, or emotional pressure.

2.3 Discourse Analysis

To interpret the social meaning of these response patterns, this study also uses a discourse analysis approach. Paltridge (2012) stated that language choices in interactions can reveal identities, social relations, and power positions between participants. In movie dialogue, the structure of conversation not only regulates turns of speech but also builds character and relationship dynamics. Cutting (2002) added that fictional dialogue retains the characteristics of real conversation, including politeness strategies, social distance, and expressions of attitude.

By combining conversation analysis, preference organization, and discourse analysis, this study not only classifies types of adjacency pairs but also explains their interactional functions. This theoretical framework enables analysis that moves from conversation structure to the interpretation of social meaning and character development in movies.

3. Research Method

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach. Creswell (2014) stated that qualitative approaches are used to understand language phenomena based on meaning, not numbers. The study focuses on adjacency pairs patterns and interactional functions in movie dialogues. The research data sources are the movie *Spider-Man Into the Spider-Verse* (2018) and its official script. The data consists of utterances between characters that contain conversation pairs. The unit of analysis is two consecutive utterances that form the first pair part and the second pair part.

Data collection was carried out through observation and recording techniques. The researcher watched the movie repeatedly while matching the dialogue with the script.

Each utterance that met the adjacency pairs criteria was marked, classified, and then entered into a data sheet. This process ensured that data identification was systematic.

Data analysis used three stages. First, identification of adjacency pair types based on the concepts of Schegloff and Sacks (1973). Second, determination of preferred and dispreferred responses using Levinson's theory (1983). Third, interpretation of the meaning of interactions using Paltridge's discourse analysis (2012). The analysis is carried out in stages, starting from the classification of structures and response patterns to the social meaning in the context of dialogue.

The results of the analysis are presented in descriptive form with dialogue quotations as evidence. This approach allows the study to explain the function of conversation and the development of character relationships in the movie.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Types of Adjacency Pairs

The analysis identified ten types of adjacency pairs in the movie dialogue: question–answer, request–acceptance, request–refusal, assessment–agreement, assessment–disagreement, greeting–greeting, offer–acceptance, offer–refusal, apology–acceptance, and compliment–acceptance. Each pair consists of a first pair part followed by a relevant second pair part as proposed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973).

1. Question–answer

Question-answer appears most frequently. Example at minute 03.03–03.07:

Jefferson : “Are you finished packing for school?”

Miles : “Yeah! Just ironing my last shirt!”

Jefferson's statement is a simple yes-or-no question. The right next step depends on the answer. Miles responds with a positive answer, completing the adjacency pair. When it comes to how things are arranged in order, the answer fits with what was expected, as Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explained.

The answer is technically correct, but it is not completely accurate. Miles spoke in an exaggerated way and added an explanation (“Just ironing my last shirt!”) to seem more believable and avoid more questions. This response shows that they are not being open and honest (Suárez, 2017). Miles uses the answer to end the interaction quickly and stay in control. This pattern shows that an answer in an adjacency pair does not only provide information it can also be a way to deal with social pressure, especially in situations involving parental authority.

From a character perspective, this moment reflects Miles' tendency to hide his real condition and feelings from his father. The adjacency pair is still complete and makes sense, but the response also suggests a certain emotional distance. This supports idea by Cutting (2002), conversations can meet social expectations while also sharing personal meaning that goes beyond the literal content..

2. Request–acceptance

Request-acceptance appears when Miles follows instructions. Example at minute 26.41–26.49:

Spider-Man : “*Promise me you’ll do this.*”

Miles : “*I promise.*”

The request does not involve a physical task, but rather a moral commitment. Miles’s response is exactly what the request said, showing that he completely accepts it without question. When it comes to preference organization, immediate compliance is a strongly preferred response (Levinson, 1983).

Miles’s trust in Spider-Man as a mentor is the reason for this acceptance. The lack of mitigation or delay suggests that they are emotionally aligned and willing to take responsibility. In the past, Miles often avoided commitment or gave evasive answers. But in this scene, he is more responsible. The adjacency pair works to complete a conversation and also marks a turning point in Miles’ personal development (Rum, 2017). This is different from the previous section, where Miles often avoided being direct. The difference in the two situations shows how the first action affects the way Miles responds.

3. Request–refusal

Request-refusal appears in family interaction at minute 06.15–06.18:

Jefferson : “*Say I love you back.*”

Miles : “*Dad, are you serious?*”

Jefferson’s statement is more like a command that asks for an emotional reaction, not a specific action. Instead of doing what he’s told, Miles asks a question. Although the response does not say “no,” it clearly does not agree with the request.

Levinson (1983) said that people often respond in a way they don’t like because they want to reduce tension with others. Miles’s use of a questioning response lets him avoid being rejected directly while showing that he is uncomfortable. In reality, this shows that they are not being defiant, just practical. The refusal protects Miles from emotional exposure while maintaining a minimal level of politeness toward his father.

4. Assessment–agreement

Assessment–agreement appears during support at minute 53.56–53.59:

Spider-Man : “*You are good, Miles.*”

Miles : “*Thank you, Peter.*”

Spider-Man makes an assessment that offers emotional support and reassurance. Miles responds with “Thank you, Petter,” which functions as a clear agreement and acceptance of the assessment. Although the response is brief, it still fulfills the role of a preferred second pair part. Levinson (1983) explained that preferred responses such as agreement are typically produced in a simple and unmarked way, without hesitation or additional explanation. Miles’ short reply indicates alignment with Spider-Man’s statement and shows his willingness to accept the emotional support being offered.

From a discourse perspective, this agreement also reflects the relationship between the two characters. Paltridge (2012) noted that response choices in interaction often reveal how speakers position themselves socially and emotionally. By agreeing with Spider-Man's statement, Miles positions himself as someone who begins to trust and rely on his mentor. This interaction contributes to the portrayal of Miles' emotional development, showing a gradual shift from isolation toward a sense of connection and support.

5. Assessment–disagreement

Assessment–disagreement appears when identity is challenged at minute 22.12–22.14:

Spider-Man : “You’re like me.”

Miles : “I don’t want to be.”

Spider-Man decides that Miles's identity is similar to his own. Miles directly rejects the idea. Although disagreement is usually reduced, Pomerantz (2021) explained that speakers may disagree directly when the assessment threatens their personal identity or emotional stability. In this case, Miles's rejection shows that he is afraid of taking responsibility and that he is confused about his identity. It does not show that he is rude to other people.

The response is structured in a way that makes it relevant to the conversation. It gives a second action that is relevant to the situation. However, it is also a strong dispreferred response. According to Paltridge (2012), when people interact, they often negotiate their identities. Miles's rejection shows that it was hard for him to accept a new identity and responsibility.

6. Greeting–greeting

Greetings-greetings functions as an opening sequence at minute 03.39–03.46:

Old friend : “Yo what’s going on, bro?”

Miles : “Hey, I’m just walking by, how you doing?”

The first utterance is a greeting and a way to make small talk. Miles responds with a return greeting and a short question. The adjacency pair is complete because the second turn acknowledges the opening and continues the interaction, which fulfills conditional relevance (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

The response is polite and cooperative, but the added phrase “I’m just walking by” makes it seem like they aren’t really interested and are keeping a distance. Yule (1996) explained that greetings often serve to keep people in touch, not to share information. In this case, Miles greets the other person and then stops interacting.

According to Paltridge (2012), the choices people make in response to a message can show their position in a relationship with the sender. Miles' simple greeting suggests he is detached from social situations and focused on his own emotions, rather than being excited.

7. Offer–acceptance

Offer-acceptance appears when help is offered at minute 22.23–22.27:

Spider-Man : “I can help you. If you stick around, I can show you the ropes.”

Miles : “Yeah.”

Spider-Man offers guidance and assistance. Miles agrees with this, which fulfills the relevant second pair part. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), if someone accepts or refuses an offer, it affects what they do next. Miles’ response matches what was expected.

According to Levinson (1983), when people are asked to choose between different responses, they usually choose the response they like most. This is called “preferred responses.” These responses are usually given directly and without any changes. Miles’ quick answer shows that he is ready to work with them right away.

In practice, accepting these signals shows trust and openness to mentorship. Although the response is minimal, it shows that they are ready to receive guidance. In earlier sections, Miles often refused to take responsibility. But in this section, he accepts responsibility, which shows that he is starting to open up emotionally and is ready to receive support.

8. Offer–refusal

Offer-refusal appears at minute 3.20 - 3.34:

Jefferson : “If you want me to drive you we gotta go now”

Miles : “No Dad, I’ll walk.”

Structurally, the offer projects acceptance or refusal as the relevant next action (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Miles says no and offers an alternative idea. According to Pomerantz (2021), refusals are often accompanied by accounts or counterbalances to reduce interpersonal tension. Miles added, “I’ll walk,” which was a way of making the offer less strong. This allowed him to reject the offer without fully rejecting the idea of working together. This is similar to what Levinson explained in 1983, that people often change their minds more than they give up.

Miles’s refusal is based on his desire to be independent and in control, not to cause conflict. According to Paltridge (2012), the choices people make often reflect their sense of identity. Miles shows that he can make his own decisions while also respecting his parents.

9. Apology–acceptance

Apology-acceptance appears at minute 15.33 - 15.41:

Miles : “Sorry... um... oh crap”

Wanda : “Ow ow ow ow ow, calm down, it’s fine.”

Miles apologizes to her first. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), when someone says “sorry,” it shows that they plan to do something important next, like accepting or acknowledging something. Wanda said “it’s fine,” which means she accepted the problem and didn’t want to deal with it anymore.

According to Levinson (1983), when people accept an apology, it's because everyone else does, too. This makes things go back to the way they were before, and it stops conflict from lasting too long. Wanda's calm tone makes the incident seem less serious and shows that she is ready to move on.

The way people accept things is based on practicality. They do not get too emotionally involved, and they have casual relationships with others. Yule (1996) said that when people say "I'm sorry" in public, it is usually to keep things going smoothly, not to deal with big problems. This interaction supports that function.

10. Compliment–acceptance

Compliment-acceptance appears at minute 1.29.40 - 1.29.51:

Gwen : "I like your suit."

Miles : "Thanks. I made it myself"

Gwen compliments Miles's suit. Miles replies with "Thanks," which shows he accepts the compliment. He then adds extra information, "I made it myself," to show that he's proud of his work. This response is still acceptance because it acknowledges the positive evaluation rather than rejecting or downplaying it.

When it comes to preference organization, accepting a compliment is considered a better response because it aligns positively with what the speaker is trying to say. Levinson (1983) explained that people usually respond in a certain way when they are asked a question. Miles' response is similar. It shows that he is open and confident. The exchange shows that the characters are friendly and supportive, which strengthens their relationship. These findings show the dialogue consistently follows adjacency pair structure across different interaction contexts.

4.2 Results of Analyzing Adjacency Pairs in *Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse*

This section addresses the second aim of the study, which is to explain the results obtained from analyzing adjacency pairs in *Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse*.

a. How Adjacency Pairs Organize Interactions

One important result of the analysis is that adjacency pairs function not only as tools for exchanging information, but as mechanisms that organize interaction and guide how conversations unfold in the movie. This finding supports the idea by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), when people say something like a question, a request, or an assessment, the other person expects more information. In the movie, you can see this pattern when the characters always react to each other in the same way. This makes the dialogue flow naturally and is easy for the audience to understand.

Each part of a conversation is connected to the previous part. This helps to create a continuous flow of conversation. For example, when a character asks a question, the next speaker is expected to answer, when a request is made, the next speaker is expected to accept or refuse it. These expectations help to keep the interaction clear and organized. Even when a character doesn't respond right away, the silence can still convey a lot. It

can show tension, hesitation, or resistance. This shows that adjacency pairs not only organize spoken interaction but also create interpretive cues for the audience.

In *Spider-Man: Into the Spider-Verse*, the adjacency pairs make the storyline clear and coherent. The movie has fast-paced action and complex multiverse elements, but the conversational structure is easy to understand because the characters respond in a way that is easy to predict. This supports the idea by Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), the order of a conversation is not random. Instead, it is organized by rules that people follow, even in scripted dialogue.

According to Paltridge (2012), the way people interact with each other affects how meaning, relationships, and identities are formed in discourse. In the movie, the way characters respond to each other through pairs of characters on the screen allows viewers to understand the characters' emotions, how close they are to each other, and the power balance between them without needing to explain it directly. For example, short answers, silence, or refusal often mean that someone is uncomfortable. On the other hand, agreeing quickly and easily shows that someone trusts you and is on the same page. These signals help the audience understand the characters' feelings and their relationships with each other.

Overall, this finding confirms that adjacency pairs are key to how conversations are organized in the movie. They help make sure that conversations make sense, make sure everyone has a chance to speak, and shape how the audience understands what is being said. The movie's consistent response patterns make it easy to understand. It successfully delivers complex emotional and narrative content in a way that feels natural and believable.

b. Miles Morales as a Reactive Participant (Power and Authority Relations)

Another important finding from the analysis is that Miles Morales often reacts to others in his interactions, especially when talking to authority figures like his father, teachers, and mentors. In many cases, Miles is more often the second speaker to respond to questions, requests, assessments, or directives than the one who starts them. This pattern shows how power relations shape the roles people play when they talk to each other every day.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explained that the first pair in an adjacency pair suggests the next appropriate action and creates pressure on the next speaker to respond appropriately. When someone in a position of authority starts a conversation, they decide what to talk about and how the conversation will go. Miles often has to respond, which shows that he doesn't have much control over how conversations go. This makes it clear that he has a lower rank in the company hierarchy.

According to Paltridge (2012), the way people take turns talking and how they respond to others often show the social hierarchy and power distribution in a group. In the movie, Jefferson's frequent use of directives (orders) and assessments (judgments) positions him as an authoritative figure, while Miles' responses often show compliance,

hesitation, or indirect resistance. These patterns show how family and social rules affect Miles' way of communicating.

Theory by Levinson (1983) about preference organization explained why Miles often produces cautious or mitigated responses. When dealing with authority figures, Miles usually avoids confrontation by giving short answers, saying "no" in a roundabout way, or just acknowledging them. These response strategies help him stay polite and avoid conflict while also saying that he is uncomfortable or disagrees. This pattern suggests that the choices we make in how we interact with others are not completely random. Instead, they are influenced by the social rules and expectations of our society.

Beyond the authority relationships, the reactive position also reflects Miles's development as a teenager. He is still learning to be independent and figure out who he is. He does not interact much because he is unsure and does not feel in control of his surroundings. As the story continues, small changes can be seen in how Miles starts to take more initiative, especially when he talks with his friends or when he becomes more confident because of his mentors. This change over time matches the idea by Paltridge (2012), the way people talk about things changes as they find their identities.

Overall, the fact that Miles mostly takes a reactive approach to interacting with others shows how power and authority influence how conversations are structured. The adjacency pairs show not only who speaks first and who responds, but also how social hierarchy affects emotional expression, decision-making, and identity negotiation throughout the story.

c. Preferred and Dispreferred Responses as Indicators of Emotional Pressure

Another important finding of this study is that the way Miles Morales responds to things reflects the emotional pressure he feels throughout the movie. In conversation analysis, Levinson (1983) explained that people tend to give direct answers without waiting or making excuses, because these answers help people work together. On the other hand, people often respond in a less direct way. They might wait a long time to answer, or they might not answer at all. They might also use words like "I don't know" or "I'm not sure" to avoid making someone feel bad. Pomerantz (2021) also said that disagreement and refusal are usually softened through mitigation, partial agreement, or explanation, unless strong emotional pressure overrides these strategies.

The analysis in Section 4.1 showed that Miles often responds in a way that is not preferred, particularly when dealing with authority figures and topics that are emotionally sensitive. These responses can be indirect refusals, minimal answers, delayed reactions, or non-verbal avoidance. These patterns are more than just different ways of saying things. They show emotional tension and internal conflict. When Miles does not give direct answers or indirectly says "no," it seems like he is dealing with fear, uncertainty, and pressure related to the expectations of adults and the new responsibilities he has.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) explained that after the first pair of actions, the second action is then expected. When Miles produces a response that is not what was expected, it becomes clear that something is off. If someone hesitates, stays silent, or talks around

the topic, it is a sign of emotional discomfort, not a communication problem. In other words, the way Miles responds can indicate his emotional state.

Non-verbal responses, like avoiding eye contact or holding back tears, also play an important role in expressing emotional pressure. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) argued that actions like looking at someone, showing emotions on your face, or moving your body can be important parts of a conversation when they happen at the right time. In several interactions, Miles uses gestures or physical avoidance instead of verbal disagreement or refusal. These responses let him show that he is not comfortable or in agreement without directly saying “no.” This is especially useful in situations where he is higher up in the hierarchy than the other person. This type of behavior shows that someone is holding their emotions in rather than expressing them through words.

As the story continues, it becomes clear that Miles’ reactions are changing little by little. People will usually respond in a certain way to this kind of message, like agreeing or saying they are happy. This change suggests that they are feeling less stressed and more confident. Paltridge (2012) said that the way people talk about things often shows how their identities and social positions are changing. In this case, the change from dispreferred to preferred responses matches Miles’ psychological development and his growing acceptance of his role and responsibilities.

Overall, the way people like or dislike responses shows that conversational choices are a sign of emotional pressure, not just random language behavior. Through the choice of responses, the movie subtly shows Miles Morales’ inner struggle, emotional adjustment, and slow progress toward confidence and self-determination.

d. Character Development Reflected through Adjacency Pairs

The analysis also showed that adjacency pairs are a way to see Miles Morales’ character development throughout the movie. Instead of showing growth only through major events in the story, the movie subtly represents psychological change through how characters interact and respond. As Thomas (1995) explained, meaning in interaction is not only conveyed through what is said, but also through how speakers respond to one another in context. Changes in how someone responds to things show changes in how confident they are, how they control their emotions, and who they think they are.

At the beginning of the movie, Miles often answers questions indirectly or defensively. Many of his turns are short, evasive, or marked by avoidance and uncertainty. These response patterns are similar to the dispreferred forms described by Levinson (1983) and Pomerantz (2021). In these cases, speakers respond in a softer way to avoid emotional discomfort and social risk. In this phase, Miles seems uncertain, reluctant to take responsibility, and uneasy with authority and expectations.

As the story continues, Miles starts to interact with others more steadily. He starts answering questions more directly, with confidence, and in a cooperative way. People who accept and agree with others more often are more in sync with them and have less inner resistance. According to Paltridge (2012), who studied this topic, our identity is

shaped by the way we interact with others. Miles's shift in behavior shows how he is growing as a person and becoming more in control of his life.

This development is also clear in how Miles handles emotionally challenging situations. Earlier interactions often show avoidance or defense, while later interactions show emotional control and readiness to engage. According to Thomas (1995), pragmatic competence is the ability to choose the right response based on the situation and the purpose of the communication. Miles is growing up. He is learning to respond in the right way and to communicate better.

Also, body language helps show how a character is changing. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) argued that actions have meaning when people interact. At first, Miles' gestures and physical reactions often show that he is uncomfortable or wants to retreat. In later scenes, similar non-verbal behaviors indicate confidence, coordination, and trust. This change highlights the evolution of his inner world without relying on direct conversation.

Overall, the adjacency pairs subtly but consistently represent Miles Morales' character growth. The movie shows how he goes from not knowing himself and feeling insecure to being confident, responsible, and self-accepting. This finding supports the idea that the way a story is told helps to create its meaning, rather than just making it easier to talk about.

e. The Role of Non-Verbal Responses in Meaning Construction

Another important finding of this study is that non-verbal responses play a significant role in creating meaning in pairs of images in the movie. Although adjacency pairs are often associated with spoken language, interaction is not limited to verbal language. Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) explained that actions like facial expressions, gestures, gaze, and physical movement can be meaningful in conversation when they are in the right order. In the context of film, these non-verbal responses stand out because visual cues strongly support interpretation.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) argued that adjacency pairs are organized based on relevance. This means that when a first action is produced, a relevant next action is expected, regardless of whether it is verbal or non-verbal. In the analyzed data, responses such as smiling, nodding, silence, eye-rolling, or physical movement consistently fulfill the role of second pair parts. These actions are part of a sequence of actions that can be understood by both the characters and the viewers.

Non-verbal responses, like body language and facial expressions, often convey emotions more directly than spoken language. Thomas (1995) said that the meaning of a message is influenced by the context, the intention of the sender, and how it is understood rather than just the words used. In several interactions, Miles expresses agreement, discomfort, resistance, or uncertainty through body language rather than words. These physical reactions show emotions without the need for words, especially in difficult or stressful situations.

According to Paltridge (2012), meaning is created through interaction, using various tools like language, body language, and visual cues. In an animated film, these resources

are carefully designed to help the audience understand the film. Using body language makes it easier for viewers to understand characters' feelings and supports the flow of the story, even when there is not much dialogue.

Also, non-verbal responses help interactions go more smoothly. In scenes that are fast-paced or emotionally intense, gestures and movements are immediate responses that keep the conversation going. This supports the idea by Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), the order of interaction depends not only on who speaks but also on how relevant what someone says is to the conversation.

Overall, the findings show that non-verbal responses are not just extra parts of adjacency pairs, but essential parts of them. They actively participate in meaning construction by conveying emotions, relationships, and intentions for interaction. This makes it clear that when studying how people talk in videos and other audiovisual media, we need to consider all the different ways people communicate. This helps us understand how meaning is created and understood.

5. Conclusion

This study found ten types of adjacency pairs in movie dialogue, namely question–answer, request–acceptance, request–refusal, assessment–agreement, assessment–disagreement, greeting–greeting, offer–acceptance, offer–refusal, apology–acceptance, and compliment–acceptance. The question–answer pattern appeared most dominantly because many interactions demanded clarification from Miles. Adjacency pairs not only regulate the order of conversation but also indicate power relations and emotional states. Dispreferred responses often appear when Miles faces family authority, while preferred responses appear in supportive mentor relationships. Direct responses increase when emotional pressure is high.

Changes in response patterns indicate character development. Miles initially avoids, gives minimal answers, and uses indirect refusals. As the story progresses, he gives acceptance, agreement, and clearer responses. Nonverbal responses such as silence, nods, and facial expressions also function as part of the conversation pair and reinforce the meaning of the interaction. These findings show that adjacency pairs play a role in building dialogue flow and character identity formation in animated movies.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Authors' contribution

The authors made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the study. The authors took responsibility for data analysis, interpretation and discussion of results. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- Bintana, K., Rukmini, D., & Sofwan, A. (2018). The Adjacency Pairs Patterns of Trumps' Victory Interview in '60 Minutes.' *English Education Journal*, 8(1), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.15294/EEJ.V8I1.22044>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Fatimah, N., Widodo, P., & Andriyanti, E. (2025). Turn Taking Patterns, Repair and Adjacency Pairs in an Online Interaction: A Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19(2), 784–791. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i2.21041>
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2 (ed.)). Polity Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118430873.est0069>
- Isgianto, L. (1983). The Adjacency Pairs Analysis on 'Six Minutes English' Conversation Script of BBC Learning English: A Study of Discourse Analysis. *Prasasti: Conference Series*, 3, 437–441. <https://doi.org/10.20961/pras.v0i0.1566>
- Iswara, J. W. (2019). Adjacency Pairs as Influenced by Gender: a Case of Casual Conversation in the Public Figure. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 10(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v10i1.3902>
- Kasni, N. W., & Budiarta, I. W. (2025). Linguistic Strategies and Conversation Style of Men and Women in Transactional Conversation at Tourism Objects. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 07(02), 797–812. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8168>
- Khalaf, W. H. F., & Sameer, E. H. (2023). Analysis of Adjacency Pairs of Cristiano's Interview. *Al-Adab Journal*, 146(1), 45–72. <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i146.4326>
- Latifah, A., & Gunawan, H. (2024). Adjacency Pairs in 'Daebak Show' YouTube Video: A Conversation Analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Literature, and Education (IJELLE)*, 5(2), 99–110. <https://doi.org/10.32585/ijelle.v5i2.4893>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marsella, W., Azwandi, & Arasuli. (2023). Types of Adjacency Pairs on The Six Minutes English Program in BBC Learning English. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 7(1), 132–147. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.7.1.132-147>
- Maulidia, N. A., & Rosyidah, A. Al. (2024). Examining Adjacency Pairs in "The Croods: A New Age" Movie: A Conversational Analysis. *Journal of Social, Culture, and Language*, 3(1), 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.21107/jscl.v3i1.27988>
- Negara, I. P. A. P., & Sedeng, I. N. (2024). Adjacency Pairs in Avatar Movie. *Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 8(4), 1–10.
- Nurhayati, Maria, N., & Suryani, L. (2020). Conversation Analysis of Adjacency Pairs on "Ariel Wengroff's Conversation with Malala Yousafzai." *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(1), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v3i1.p83-92>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pardede, N. L., & Silalahi, D. E. (2020). An Analysis Adjacency Pairs of Conversation in

- Black Panther Movie. *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 198–214. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v6i2.49147>
- Permatasari, I., & Listiyanti. (2017). Adjacency Pairs in Drama Script “Teen Angel” by D.M. Ahmad Dahlan *Journal of English Studies (ADJES)*, 4(2), 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.26555/adjes.v4i2.6413>
- Pomerantz, A. (2021). *Asking and Telling in Conversation*. Oxford University Press.
- Putri, N. P., & Rahayu, F. E. S. (2022). An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in Purple Hearts (2022) Film. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 9(2), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v9i3.22634>
- Rahmawati, Z. N., Musarokah, S., & Ardini, S. N. (2021). Adjacency Pairs in English Textbooks Entitled Bright: An English Course and When English Rings A Bell: A Comparative Study. *Undergraduate Conference on Applied Linguistics, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(1), 122–137.
- Rum, M. (2017). Discourse Analysis: Analysing Adjacency Pairs of Teacher and Students. *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 5(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v5i2.30>
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289–327. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289>
- Setiani, D. E., Wardani, E., & Roiyasa, N. (2025). Conversational Analysis on Adjacency Pairs Occurred in Teaching and Learning English of Intellectual Disability Classroom: A Descriptive Study at a Special Needs School. *Journal of English Literature, Linguistic, and Education*, 6(2), 23–33.
- Suárez, A. V. (2017). The Question-Answer Adjacency Pair in Dementia Discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12185>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Trihartanti, R. P., & Septiyan, S. J. (2021). The Role of Adjacency Pairs to Create Politeness Strategies in Students’ Phatic Utterances. *Register Journal*, 14(2), 243–262. <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v14i2.243-262>
- Umami, R., Irawan2, N., Perangin-angin, S., & Puspita, C. (2023). Adjacency Pairs in Jokowi’s Interview With CNN Host. *Majalah Ilmiah Warta Dharmawangsa*, 17(1), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.46576/wdw.v17i1.2936>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.