British: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris
Volume 15, No. 1, June 2026, pp 1-13
E-ISSN 2685-337X
https://journal.umgo.ac.id/index.php/British/index

Adjacency Pairs in *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish*

Ni Kadek Suarti1[1], Made Susini[2*], Radha Andhra Swari[3]
[1-3]*English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Warmadewa, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia*

*Correspondence email: madesusini@yahoo.com

Abstract
Adjacency pairs play a crucial role in organizing speech, guiding responses, and ensuring a smooth flow of communication in conversation. Misunderstandings and disruptions in adjacency pairs, such as unexpected responses or preference violations, often occur, affecting the coherence and effectiveness of interactions. The adjacency pair patterns applied in conversation are heavily dependent on the context of conversation, such as popular media, classroom studies, and others. Deploying Schegloff's conversation analysis, this study investigates adjacency pairs in the animated film Puss in Boots: The Last Wish. The data are in the form of dialogues and were collected from transcribed dialogues found in the film. The results of the analysis reveal that six types of adjacency pairs are found: greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance/rejection, request-compliance/refusal, invitation-acceptance/declination, question-answer, and assessment-agreement/disagreement. Due to the type of response the characters have, the characters act as two types of responses, and those are preferred and dispreferred responses. This result implies that the characters of animated film act naturally. This study provides insights into how adjacency pairs function within fictional discourse and enhances the understanding of conversational structures in animated films.

Keywords: *Adjacency pairs; communication; conversation function; animated film*

INTRODUCTION

Communication is one of the basic human activities. It is a process in which information, ideas, and feelings are exchanged between two or more people, often known as conversation. Conversation deals with the exchange of communication between two or more individuals who are speaking about something to achieve their goals. In a conversation, there is often a misunderstanding between the interlocutors caused by the unclear message to be 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.

Conversation can be found in our daily lives, including formal communication such as interviews, meetings, and events. In addition, conversation can be written or non-written. Written conversations can be found in newspapers, invitations, poetry, songs, stories, and so on, whereas non-written conversations can be found in everyday life, conversations between two or more people in a video or movie. Furthermore, conversation becomes the main focus in conversation analysis, where researchers examine how messages, ideas, and meanings are created and understood by conversation participants. In conversation analysis, the relationship between language use and conversation is very close. A concept in conversation analysis is adjacency pairs.

Adjacency pairs are fundamental units of conversational organization and a key way in which meanings are communicated and interpreted in conversation. Adjacency

pairs are categorized into some types, such as question-answer, greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance/rejection, request-complain, invitation-acceptant, assessment-agreement. The function of adjacency pairs is to create a framework in conversation, help conversation participants understand their roles, and keep the interaction smooth. This means that communication can occur if the meaning of language produced by the first speaker can be understood by the second speaker. How the listener responds or responds to the speaker's speech depends on how the language is produced so that the meaning of the language can be conveyed to the listener to get the appropriate response or response (Schegloff, 2007).

Several previous studies have investigated the use of Adjacency Pairs in various versions. Ali (2018) conducted research titled "Conversation Analysis of the Structural Units of Interactions in American and Iraqi TV Talk Shows: The Doctors and Shabab Wbanat ". Other studies on online media were conducted by Izza et al. (2019) and Saptiyanto & Rukmini (2022). Communication in schools between teachers and students influences teaching-learning process. Based on this, there have been a number of studies working on the communication analysis at school, as carried out by Widiyastuti & Rustono (2018), Indarti (2018), Fenyi & Nyarkoh (2022), and Trihartanti & Septiyan (2021). To create interactive teaching-learning process and to create politeness, teachers are expected to use appropriate types of adjacency pairs. Conversation between two or more people can be found in everyday life, including in film. Therefore, analyzing conversation in movies has become a researcher's concern (Pardede et al.,2021).

Referring to the studies carried out previously, the studies mostly focused on popular media and classroom studies. The study on adjacency pairs in a specific digital media, i.e. animated films, has rarely been discussed. This research has important significance in understanding the dynamics of conversation in *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish*. It is an American computer-animated comedy adventure movie. The movie was directed by Joel Crawford with co-direction by Januel Mercado, written by Paul Fisher, and starring the voices of Antonio Banderas and Salma Hayek. Watching the movie, it is discover that several conversations between the first and second participants in the film do not go well because they are interrupted by other participants and the character of the movie also includes animal such as the character of Cat. This is the reason why the movie is interesting to be investigated to contribute to understanding conversational structure in a specific context. Deploying Schegloff's conversation analysis, this study aims to determine the types of adjacency pairs to convey the message in the movie *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish*.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study focusing on adjacency pairs in a movie is conversation analysis based. The data were taken from the movie *Puss in the Boots: The last wish*. The movie is a 2022 American animated adventure comedy film. The duration of this movie is 102 minutes on Netflix. The movie contains many types of adjacency pairs that are interesting to be investigated. Since adjacency pairs deal with conversation, the data of this study are in the form of dialogues or conversations used in the movie.

Techniques of Data Collection

The data collection was carried out in some steps. Firstly, the movie *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish* searched from the internet was watched. Secondly, the transcripts of the movie were downloaded. The conversations between characters that show types of adjacency pairs were transcribed and coded in a code sheet. Every chosen conversation was placed in a certain sequence to enable the study of potential affinity-matching patterns that emerge organically from character interactions. When there are data of the clearest preferred/dispreferred responses, which show the same characteristics based on the types of adjacency pairs, only five data are chosen as representative data for analysis.

Techniques of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the study employed the content analysis method. The data analysis was conducted using some procedures. Firstly, we identified adjacency pairs found in the movie *Puss in Boots: the Last Wish*. When the utterances consist of two turns spoken by different speakers, occurring one after the other, they would be identified as adjacency pairs. The first turn which initiates an exchange is the first pair part (FPP) and the second turn which provides a relevant response is the second pair part (SPP). When a speaker delivers an FPP, and the response aligns with expectation, it is termed as a preferred SPP, whereas when it deviates from expectation, it is termed as a dispreferred SPP. Secondly, categorizing adjacency pairs based on their types by referring to the theory proposed by Schegloff (2007). Third, explain each type of adjacency pair found. Lastly, we draw conclusion.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents a discussion of adjacency pairs found in the movie *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish.* Based on the data found, all types of adjacency pairs occur in the movie. They include question and answer, greeting and greeting, offer-acceptance/rejection, request-compliance/refusal, invitation-acceptance/ declination, and assessment-agreement/disagreement. Viewed from the clearest preferred/dispreferred responses the dialogues have, 15 data are analyzed as the representative.

Question-Answer Adjacency Pairs

The question–answer pair is one of the most common and important types of conversation. It happens when one person asks a question (first pair part) and the other person gives an answer (second pair part). Questions can be yes/no questions, wh-questions, or choice questions. The type of question asked affects the kind of answer expected. Schegloff (2007) explained that if someone delays or avoids answering, it might mean there is a problem in the conversation or that the person has a reason for not answering directly. The following are the representative data of the question-answer found in the movie.

Datum 1
Puss : “Uh, excuse me, does this have shellfish in it?”
Waitress : “Yes, sir.”
[11:09–11:12]

In this conversation, Puss asks, "Uh, excuse me, does this have shellfish in it?", so the first-pair part (FPP) is a yes/no question, initiating the adjacency pair aimed at confirming whether the food contains shellfish. The scene in the movie shows that the waitress responds immediately by saying "Yes, sir," which means that the second-pair part (SPP) is a straightforward and expected answer, making it a preferred response. This exchange follows the structure of a question–answer adjacency pair, as described by Schegloff (2007). The waitress' response is considered a preferred response because it is given without hesitation, avoidance, or unnecessary delay. When a response is delayed or avoided, it may indicate a problem in the conversation, such as uncertainty, reluctance, or an attempt to withhold information. However, in this case, the conversation remains smooth because the waitress provides a cooperative and expected response. This kind of adjacency pair is often found in service interactions, where customers ask for information and employees are expected to provide quick and accurate answers.

Datum 2
Kitty : "What? Is he deranged?
Puss : "Yep."
[39:01–39:04]

This exchange shows a yes/no question with expressing surprise and concern. Puss responds with a brief but direct answer, "Yep." This is another example of a preferred response because it immediately confirms Kitty's assumption without any hesitation or elaboration. In adjacency pairs, responses can be either preferred (direct and cooperative) or dispreferred (delayed, hesitant, or avoiding the question). Puss's response follows the expected conversational structure by providing a simple confirmation, allowing the conversation to proceed smoothly. Since Kitty's question carries an emotional reaction (surprise or disbelief), the direct "Yep" reinforces the statement without unnecessary explanation. Kitty's "What? Is he deranged?" serves as a first pair part in an adjacency pair, structured as a question that expects confirmation or denial. Her tone suggests surprise or disbelief, makes the question not an inquiry but also an evaluative remark. Puss's "Yep" functions as the second pair part, providing a direct confirmation without elaboration.

Greeting-Greeting Adjacency Pairs

The greeting–greeting pair is a simple but important way to start a conversation. One person greets the other (first pair part), and the other person responds with a greeting (second pair part). This exchange helps people recognize each other and create a friendly atmosphere before talking about other things. Greetings are usually short and direct, like "Hello" and "Hi." However, they can change based on culture, relationships, or situations. According to Schegloff (2007), if someone does not respond to a greeting, it can seem rude or show that something is wrong between the speakers. The following are the dialogues considered as greeting-greeting type of adjacency pairs.

Datum 3
Mama Luna : "Hi, Bon Bon."
Bon Bon (Cat) : "Meow."
[19:27–19:33]

This scene presents a greeting adjacency pair, where Mama Luna says "Hi, Bon Bon." and Bon Bon answers with "Meow." In adjacency pairs, greetings typically expect a response, and Bon Bon fulfills this expectation with a vocal acknowledgment. While "Meow" is not a conventional human greeting, in the context of the interaction, it serves the same function, showing recognition and engagement in the exchange. The response is a preferred response because Bon Bon reacts immediately and appropriately to Mama Luna's greeting. If the cat had remained silent or ignored the greeting, it would have been a dispreferred response, which could indicate indifference or rejection of interaction. Despite being a non-verbal response, Bon Bon's reaction still maintains the flow of conversation, demonstrating how adjacency pairs can function even in exchanges between humans and animals.

In terms of turn-taking, the exchange follows a natural sequence, where Mama Luna takes the first turn and Bon Bon responds in a timely manner. There is no interruption, hesitation, or overlap, making it a well-structured dialogue. The conversation also fits within preference organization, as Bon Bon's response aligns with the expected pattern of a greeting exchange. If Bon Bon had remained silent, that would have been considered a dispreferred response. The response, even though nonverbal, is interpreted as a positive and appropriate reaction within the context of their relationship.

Datum 4
Puss : "Hey! Hola, amigo."
Amigo : "Good to see you again."
[13:46–13:50]

This dialogue represents a greeting adjacency pair, where Puss initiates the exchange with "Hey! Hola, amigo," and Amigo responds with "Good to see you again." Greetings are essential for opening conversations and establishing rapport, and in this case, both participants engage in a smooth interaction. Amigo does not simply mirror the greeting but extends it with a more personalized response, reinforcing the connection between them. The response is preferred since Amigo acknowledges Puss's greeting in a friendly and positive manner. A dispreferred response might have been silence, hesitation, or a dismissive remark, which could create an awkward or strained interaction. Instead, Amigo's words contribute to the natural flow of the exchange and reflect warmth and familiarity. Puss uses "Hola, amigo,", mixing Spanish with English, which adds a sense of cultural identity and informality. Meanwhile, Amigo's response, "Good to see you again," suggests familiarity and a sense of reunion, implying that they have met before and shared a positive history. Puss initiates the exchange with "Hey! Hola, amigo," serving as the first-pair part, and Amigo responds with "Good to see you again," acting as the second-pair part. The interaction follows a smooth transition, where Puss initiates the conversation, and his amigo immediately responds without pause or overlap. From the standpoint of preference organization, the response given by Puss's amigo is a preferred response. When someone greets another person, an expected or socially preferred reaction is to acknowledge the greeting and reciprocate it with a warm or neutral statement. If the amigo had ignored the greeting or responded in a cold manner, that would have been a dispreferred response. The amigo's response, "Good to see you again," is more than just a reply; it expresses

warmth and recognition, strengthening their social bond. In this way, the exchange is not only a mechanical adjacency pair but also a way to express emotion and reinforce familiarity between the characters.

Offer-Acceptance/Rejection Adjacency Pairs

An offer-acceptance/rejection adjacency pair occurs when one speaker extends an offer. The response can be either acceptance or rejection. Preferred responses are often direct acceptances, whereas rejections may be delayed or mitigated with explanations to soften their impact. This study found some data of this type, which are presented in the following discussion.

Datum 5
Papa Bear : "What say we go and hibernate, eh?"
Goldilocks : "No!"
[27:19–27:22]

Papa Bear's utterance, "What say we go and hibernate, eh?" serves as the first pair part in the adjacency pair of an offer-acceptance/rejection. The phrase "What say we" frame it as an indirect offer rather than a direct request. This type of FPP creates an expectation that the next speaker will either accept or reject the offer. Goldilocks responds with a sharp and immediate "No!" as the second pair part, which shows a dispreferred response. In adjacency pair theory, dispreferred responses tend to be softened with hesitation markers, explanations, or polite refusals. However, Goldilocks's refusal conveys a marked and confrontational rejection. The lack of a reason or delay signals her strong disagreement, possibly indicating irritation or an unwillingness to engage further in the conversation. Goldilocks' response represents a dispreferred response since rejecting a suggestion typically requires some form of mitigation (e.g., "I'm not sure" or "Maybe later"). However, her direct "No!" is abrupt and unmitigated, which may indicate strong feelings or urgency.

Datum 6
Perrito: "I'll come… I'll come with you."
Puss : "Sorry, Perro. Puss in Boots walks alone!"
[28:50–28:53]

Perrito's statement, "I'll come… I'll come with you." functions as an FPP, Puss's response, "Sorry, Perro. Puss in Boots walks alone!" serves as the SPP, forming a rejection. Puss uses "Sorry" as a politeness strategy, acknowledging Perrito's feelings before delivering the refusal. According to adjacency pair theory, dispreferred responses are often softened with an apology, explanation, or hedging, which Puss demonstrates here. However, his follow-up statement, "Puss in Boots walks alone!" is a firm declarative that reinforces his refusal by presenting it as a personal principle rather than just turning down Perrito's offer. This utterance aligns with Schegloff's idea that dispreferred responses are typically expanded with additional information.

In this exchange, Perrito offer to accompany Puss, saying, "I'll come… I'll come with you." Puss, however, shuts him down with, "Sorry, Perro. Puss in Boots walks alone!" Perrito hesitates slightly, repeating "I'll come", which might suggest nervousness or hopefulness. On the other hand, Puss responds without hesitation,

maintaining control of the conversation. This is also a clear example of preference organization. Normally, when rejecting an offer, people soften their response to avoid being too harsh. Puss does this slightly by adding "Sorry, Perro," but his statement remains blunt. From an action formation & ascription perspective, Perrito's line is more than just an offer; it is a sign of loyalty and a desire to stay by Puss's side. But Puss's response is not just about turning him down. It reflects his belief that he's meant to be alone, whether out of habit, pride, or fear of attachment. His words are not just rejecting Perrito, but they reinforce the identity he has built for himself.

Datum 7
Perrito: "Rub for luck?"
Puss : "I don't need luck for this."
[29:36–29:37]

In this exchange, Perrito's FPP, "Rub for luck?" is an offer framed as a yes/no question, inviting either acceptance or rejection. Puss's response, "I don't need luck for this." acts as the SPP, but instead of being a direct rejection, it subtly changes the focus from Perrito's offer to a self-assured statement about his own skills. According to Schegloff, dispreferred responses often include an alternative perspective, which Puss provides by rejecting the entire concept of luck rather than merely eclining Perrito's gesture. His response also avoids direct negation ("No"), making it structurally different from previous refusals. However, it still functions as a rejection, reinforcing Puss's independence while downplaying Perrito's contribution.

The phrasing of the FPP makes it an offer, which signals Perrito's desire to help. His tone implies optimism and sets up an expected response from Puss. Instead of a simple acceptance or rejection, the second speaker gives a reason for declining. This response fits into preference organization as a dispreferred response since he refuses the offer while justifying his confidence. A straightforward acceptance, like "Sure," would have been a preferred response. Meanwhile, Puss's response is not just a refusal but also a statement of self-assurance, it emphasizes his belief in his own skill rather than relying on luck.

Request-Compliance/Refusal Adjacency Pairs

A request happens when one person asks another person to do something (first pair part), and the other person either agrees or refuses (second pair part). Schegloff (2007) states that people usually try to say no in a polite way, giving a reason to avoid being too direct. Requests can sound different depending on how urgent or polite they are, and they often depend on the relationship between the people talking. Compliance refers to agreeing to or following a request, instruction, rule, or social expectation. In conversation analysis, compliance often appears in request-response adjacency pairs, where one speaker makes a request and the other responds by fulfilling it. Meanwhile, refusal is a direct or indirect act of saying no to an offer, request, or invitation. This type is demonstrated in the data below.

Datum 8
Mama Bear : "Can we get all of that in a bag to go?"
Goldilocks : "Ah! Would you stop talking about blooming pies!"
[34:36-34:38]

In this conversation, Mama Bear's question, "Can we get all of that in a bag to go?" serves as the first pair part of an adjacency pair, functioning as a request for food to be packed. Based on adjacency pair theory, the expected second pair part should be either compliance ("Sure, I'll pack it up for you") or refusal ("Sorry, we can't do that"). However, Goldilocks's response, "Ah! Would you stop talking about blooming pies!" does not directly follow this pattern. Instead of explicitly complying or refusing, she shifts the focus to her frustration. This represents dispreferred response behavior, where instead of giving a straightforward rejection, the speaker expresses irritation. According to Schegloff (2007), dispreferred responses often involve additional elements such as hesitation or explanation, and in this case, Goldilocks's emotional reaction serves as an indirect refusal. Goldilocks does not directly respond to the request, making her reply a dispreferred SPP. Instead of answering with a simple "yes" or "no," she expresses annoyance, shifting the conversation's focus.

Datum 9
Perrito: "Please don't tell anyone. I need this."
Puss : "I won't tell. I don't care."
[23:28– 23:31]

In his datum, Perrito's statement, "Please don't tell anyone. I need this.", functions as a first pair part in the adjacency pair of Request-Compliance/Refusal. A request typically seeks an action or commitment from the listener, and in this case, Perrito asks Puss to keep a secret. The expression "Please don't tell anyone" is a direct request, whereas "I need this." serves as a justification, emphasizing the importance of the request. Puss's response, "I won't tell. I don't care.", serves as the second pair part in the adjacency pair. The first sentence, "I won't tell," is a compliance, which aligns with a preferred response since it directly grants the request. However, the second sentence, "I don't care," complicates the interaction. While compliance is expected to maintain social harmony, adding "I don't care" introduces a dispreferred element, as it dismisses the significance of the request.

Perrito's statement, "Please don't tell anyone. I need this," functioning as a First Pair Part (FPP), is specifically a request combined with a justification. He asks Puss to keep a secret and emphasizes its importance to him. The expected second pair part would be either agreement or refusal. Puss responds, "I won't tell. I don't care," which technically fulfills the SPP by agreeing to the request but does so in a dismissive way.

Invitation-Acceptance/Declination Adjacency Pairs

When someone invites another person to do something, like attend an event or join an activity, it anticipates a response of acceptance or polite decline. This response is important for maintaining social balance. If someone receives an invitation, accepting it is the expected or "preferred" response, whereas declining (or refusing) is considered "dispreferred." This means that people tend to accept invitations directly, whereas refusals are often softened with explanations or delays to avoid sounding impolite (Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 2007). One data of this type is explained below.

Datum 10
Puss : "Come on, eat! Drink up ha ha!"
Party Goer : "Yes, I'd love to!"
[13:46–13:50]

Puss's utterance, "Come on, eat! Drink up ha ha!" and the partygoer's response, "Yes, I'd love to!" fit into the Invitation-Acceptance/Declination type of adjacency pairs. In this structure, one speaker extends an invitation, and the other either accepts (preferred response) or declines (dispreferred response). In this case, the partygoer provides a preferred response by accepting the invitation, maintaining the flow of the conversation, and reinforcing social harmony. The FPP (First Pair Part), Puss's statement functions as an invitation or encouragement, urging the listener to partake in food and drink. The second pair part follows naturally as the partygoer agrees with an enthusiastic acceptance. The partygoer responds promptly without interruption, which makes for a smooth exchange.

Assessment-Agreement/Disagreement Adjacency Pairs

An assessment-agreement/disagreement adjacency pair occurs when one speaker provides an evaluation or opinion and the other either agrees or disagrees. Schegloff (2007) described that agreement is often the preferred response in conversation because it helps maintain a smooth and positive interaction. According to Cutting (2008), responses that show refusals and disagreements tend to be displeased. The data showing this type can be seen in the following.

Datum 11
Baby Bear : "What? I'm smart, ain't I? Ain't I, Papa?"
Papa Bear : "No. You ain't well fixed for brains."
[28:03–28:05]

In this exchange, Baby Bear's statement functions as an assessment (FPP), as he evaluates himself as "smart" and seeks confirmation from his father. His repeated questioning, "Ain't I, Papa?", suggests that he expects agreement, making agreement the preferred response in this case. However, Papa Bear's response (SPP) is a direct disagreement, saying, "No. You ain't well fixed for brains." This is a dispreferred response because disagreement can disrupt the flow of conversation and potentially create conflict. Unlike typical dispreferred responses, which often include softening strategies, Papa Bear's response is blunt and making the disagreement more confrontational. Papa Bear's bluntness contrasts with typical softened rejections, making the response humorously harsh.

Datum 12
Kitty : "I hate it. It's disgusting."
Puss : "Well, I love it. It's distinguished."
[33:41–33:43]

Kitty's statement shows that she strongly expresses her dislike for something. The use of the words "hate" and "disgusting" shows a strong negative opinion, making agreement the preferred response for a smooth and harmonious interaction. Typically, when someone expresses a strong feeling, an agreeing response is expected because it creates a sense of shared understanding. On the other hand, Puss's response is a disagreement, as he directly contradicts Kitty's statement. He states the opposite: "Well, I love it. It's distinguished." The word choice in Puss's response is important because it signals a deliberate contrast. By using "love" instead of "hate" and "distinguished" instead of "disgusting", Puss presents a completely opposing

perspective. Despite disagreeing, Puss moderates his response using the discourse marker "Well," which slightly softens the disagreement. This strategy makes the response sound less abrupt or harsh. Additionally, the word "distinguished" gives a rational reason for his positive evaluation rather than contradicting Kitty outright. This follows Schegloff's (2007) idea that people tend to adjust their language when disagreeing to maintain a positive conversational flow.

Datum 13
Baby Bear : "Oh, it's gonna be wicked."
Papa Bear : "Yeah! Imagine us."
[59:17–59:18]

Baby Bear's statement functions as an assessment, where he expresses excitement about something that is going to happen. The phrase "Oh, it's going to be wicked" suggests a positive expectation. This type of assessment typically invites agreement, as agreement helps build enthusiasm and strengthen social bonds between speakers. Papa Bear provides an agreement, confirming Baby Bear's excitement. His immediate response, "Yeah!", serves as an explicit agreement marker. Instead of simply stopping at agreement, he adds "Imagine us," which expands on the shared excitement and continues the conversation. This type of agreement is commonly seen in casual and enthusiastic conversations, where people agree with each other and contribute additional remarks to extend the topic. The positive tone of this exchange makes it clear that both speakers share the same enthusiasm.

Datum 14
Puss : "You know, to be honest, Chomper is pretty good."
Perrito: "Yeah, but no."
[1:32:30-1:32:32]

Puss's statement is an assessment (FPP), where he gives a positive evaluation of the name "Chomper". The phrase "to be honest" suggests that he is making a genuine statement, possibly implying that he expects agreement or that his opinion might be unexpected. Perrito's response (SPP) is a disagreement, but it is structured in an interesting way: "Yeah, but no." Instead of simply rejecting Puss's opinion outright, Perrito initially acknowledges it with "Yeah," which could create the impression of partial agreement. However, he immediately contradicts it with "but no," signaling that he actually disagrees. This type of indirect disagreement is a common conversational strategy used to soften rejection. Rather than bluntly saying "No, it's bad," Perrito frames his disagreement to sound less harsh or confrontational and keeps the conversation more engaging. Perrito's "Yeah, but no." serves as the second pair part and represents a dispreferred response, as it initially agrees but ultimately rejects it. This conversation fits within the assessment-agreement/disagreement adjacency pair structure, where the second speaker does not fully align with the first speaker's stance.

Datum 15
Kitty : "I think you like him."
Puss : "No. No, I don't."
[53:24–53:26]

In datum 15, Kitty expresses an opinion about Puss's feelings. The phrase "I think" introduces her assessment in a somewhat tentative way, suggesting that she is open to correction. However, it still functions as an evaluation of Puss's emotions, making agreement the preferred response. Puss's response is a disagreement, as he directly denies Kitty's claim. The repetition of "No." before saying "No, I don't." makes the rejection sound stronger and more emphatic. Instead of providing an explanation or softening his response, Puss firmly denies the statement without elaboration. In this case, Puss chooses a more direct and defensive approach. This suggests that his response might be influenced by emotional factors, such as wanting to hide his true feelings or feeling annoyed by Kitty's assumption.

Kitty's statement, "I think you like him," presents an assumption about Puss's feelings, setting up an expectation for either agreement or denial. Puss immediately rejects the claim with "No. No, I don't." This exchange forms a classic first pair part and SPP second pair part, where the second turn contradicts rather than aligns with the first, making it a dispreferred response.

In Summary, based on the analysis of adjacency pairs found in *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish*, six types of adjacency pairs are found. These types advance the story line identified from the exchange between the FPP and SPP. Due to the animated movie, the SPP could be in non-verbal form, such as expressed by the character of Cat represented by the response "Meow". This non-verbal response is only found in greeting-greeting type of adjacency pair.Due to the type of response the characters have, to make the conversation in the movie flow smoothly, the characters act preferred response and to disrupt the expected flow, the characters act dispreferred response. This implies that the characters of animated films act in common responses. This study provides insights into how adjacency pairs function within fictional discourse and enhances the understanding of conversational structures in animated films.

CONCLUSION DAN SUGGESTIONS

This study examined the adjacency pairs in *Puss in Boots: The Last Wish*. Through a conversation analysis of character dialogues, six primary types of adjacency pairs have been identified. They are greeting-greeting, offer-acceptance/rejection, request-compliance/refusal, invitation-acceptance/declination, question-answer, and assessment-agreement/disagreement. Each pair plays a crucial role in facilitating communication and enhancing the narrative structure of the film. The findings reveal that these adjacency pairs are instrumental in character development, portraying relationships, and advancing the storyline.

The use of adjacency pairs not only serves to establish social connections among characters but also reflects the intricacies of human communication and interaction. This research contributes valuable insights into the dynamics of conversations within animated films, underscoring the significance of dialogue in shaping character interactions and plot progression. In terms of the genre of the movie as animated movie, this study finds that the SPP can be in non-verbal form as represented by the character of an animal such as a cat and it is only found in greeting-greeting type.

This study only focuses on the types of adjacency pairs in animated films by applying the conversational analysis theory. By this research, it is recommended that there would be other studies which view adjacency pairs from other contexts such as different film genre or from other perspectives such as Halliday's systemic functional theory (2024).

REFERENCES

Ali, H. K. (2018). Conversation Analysis of the Structural Units of Interactions in American and Iraqi TV Talk Shows: The Doctors and Shabab Wbanat. International Journal of Language Academy, 6, 311-333. https://doi.org/10.18033/IJLA.3870.

Cutting, J. (2008). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. New York: Routledge.

Fenyi, D.A. & Nyarkoh, I.O. (2022). Turn-taking as a Pedagogical Strategy in Classroom Interaction: A Conversation Analysis of Adjacency Pairs. Linguistics Initiative, 2 (2), 107-125. https://doi.org/10.53696/27753719.2225.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (Fourth Edi). New York: Routledge.

Indarti, G.A.P. (2018). Adjacency Pairs Analysis on Teaching-Learning Process. 2nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings, 204-210.

Izza, A., Mujiyanto, J., Yuliasri, I. (2019). The Comparison of Conversational Structures between Zach Sang and the Radio 1 Breakfast Shows. English Education Journal, 9 (3), 421-427.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pardede, N/L., Herman, &Silalahi, D.E. (2021). An Analysis Adjacency Pairs of Conversation in Black Panther Movie. Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics, 6(2), 198-214.

Saptiyanto, B., Rukmini, D. &Yulianto, H.J. (2022). The Use of Adjacency Pair Patterns in "Ancora Meet" Interview with Nadiem Anwar Makarim. English Education Journal, 12(4), 459-469.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007). Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v14i2.243-262.

Widiyastuti, W. &Rustono. (2018). Adjacency Pair of Conversation on Interactional Discourse in High School Learning. Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 7(3), 293-299. https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i3.28523.