ADJACENCY PAIRS AS UTTERED IN THE CONVERSATIONS OF SOFIA COPPOLA'S LOST IN TRANSLATION MOVIE SCRIPT

PASANGAN BERDAMPINGAN PADA UJARAN PERCAKAPAN DI NASKAH FILM *LOST IN TRANSLATION* KARYA SOFIA COPPOLA

Heri Mudra
Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Kerinci
Jl. Kapten Muradi Desa Sumur Jauh Kec. Pesisir Bukit Kota Sungai Penuh, 37172,
Indonesia
Email: mudraheri@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper contains a discussion of the structures of Adjacency Pairs as uttered in the conversations of Lost in Translation movie script in terms of conversational analysis study. A conversation consists of at least two turns and two utterances which contain two acts of speech. Such utterances consisting of a first pair part which is followed by a second pair part form adjacent pairs which can be either preferred or dispreferred responses. Adjacency Pairs in term of preferred responses include twenty eight structures, while those in term of dispreferred responses include fourteen structures. The choice of a variety of responses is influenced by habits and cultures through which speakers convey meaning. Different habits and cultures of the speakers allow them to produce particular utterances which contain particular acts of speech. Subjectivity and intention influence the second speaker to respond the first speaker's act based on what is intended. This is psychologically subjective rather than illogical. The complex structures of Adjacency Pairs are also caused by noises, unclear voices, and complex sentence patterns. The variations of adjacent pairs are basically contextual and situational which imply that Adjacency Pairs emerge in different structures within different contexts of conversations.

Keywords: *Adjacency pairs, turn taking, conversation, speech act, utterance*

Abstrak

Artikel ini berisi pembahasan tentang pola Pasangan Berdampingan berdasarkan ujaran percakapan pada naskah filem Lost in Translation melalui teori analisis percakapan. Percakapan terdiri atas dua giliran and ujaran yang mengandung dua tindak tutur. Ujaran-ujaran yang terdiri atas bagian berdampingan pertama dan diikuti bagian berdampingan kedua sehingga membentuk pasangan berdampingan baik dengan respon yang diharapkan maupun yang tidak diharapkan. Pasangan Berdampingan khususnya respon yang diharapkan terdiri atas dua puluh delapan pola berdampingan, sedangkan respon yang tidak diharapkan terdiri atas empat belas pola. Ragam respon

dapat dipengaruhi oleh kebiasaan dan budaya pembicara pada saat berbicara. Perbedaan kebiasaan dan budaya mempengaruhi pembicara dalam membuat ujaran yang mengandung tindak tutur tertentu. Subjektifitas dan intensi juga dapat mempengaruhi respon pembicara kedua terhadap tindak tutur pembicara pertama. Hal ini bersifat subjektif namun bukan tidak logis. Pola yang komplels pada Pasangan Berdampingan juga dapat dipengaruhi oleh suasana ribut, suara yang kurang jelas, dan struktur kalimat yang kompleks. Ragam pola tersebut pada dasarnya bersifat kontekstual dan situasional yang berarti bahwa pola Pasangan Berdampingan akan berbeda pada konteks percakapan yang berbeda.

Kata kunci: *Pasangan berdampingan, giliran berbicara, konversasi, tindak tutur, ujaran*

Introduction

Conversation cannot be separated from the term communication. As a process of sending and receiving information, communication places the importance on conversation which is an essential element in most parts of communication. Conversation itself should be comprised with a speaker and a hearer who occupy their own functions and tasks (Baiat et al, 2013; Hagoort & Meyer, 2013). A speaker, as the name implies, is a doer in a conversation whose task is to send information to a hearer. The hearer is one who receives the information sent by the speaker. In a conversation, the task of both the speaker and the hearer is clearly autonomous which means that each of them knows what they have to say and what they should respond based on preceding utterance made by the speaker. This is, then, called turn taking which allows each speaker and hearer takes turn during a conversation (Duncan, 1972; Sack, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Garcia, 1991). However, conversation is always challenging for speakers and hearers. It is because conversation is a complicated process through which the speaker and the hearer share their roles. Each role can be mutually opposed between the speaker and the hearer as both of them propose similar or different speech acts during conversation. For example, a speaker who proposes a question should be followed by an answer of a hearer. Yet, such expected response might be different when the hearer asks another question to the speaker. Thus, it has been a common ground that each speaker has response in mind which is expected or which is not expected by the first speaker (Orestrom, 1983; Coates, 2004).

In a conversation, both the speaker and the hearer do take their turn during conversational exchanges, but the acts as implied can be either preferred or dispreferred acts. Each conversation has its systematic pattern and the patterns are predictable though sometime are not easily predicted. This refers to the term Adjacency Pairs. Schegloff (2007: 3) states that Adjacency Pairs are sequential turn of a speaker and a hearer whose speech can "be tracked fro where they came from, what is being done through them, and where they might be going" during conversation. Conversation consists of an orderly sequence as uttered by speaker and hearer. Such sequence is known as pairs of utterances which are expected to be interrelated. Furthermore, Schegloff and Sacks (1973: 259-296) state that in Adjacency Pairs there are particular acts as produced by the speaker and the hearer and are usually noticeable such as greeting-greeting, question-answer, offer-accept/decline.

Adjacency Pairs consist of first pair part and second pair part. Each pair part is identified by looking at the utterance as produced by the speaker and the hearer. The first pair part allows the second pair part to be adjacent (Schegloff, 2007). Coulthard (1985: 70) defines Adjacency Pairs as contributive exchanges in a conversation as Adjacency Pairs help determine the first speaker whose task is to initiate a conversation and the second speaker as the hearer who gives a response based on the speaker's initiated act. Adjacency Pairs also help maintain the role of both the speaker and the learner and avoid them from abusing their turn as conversation is going. This is supported by Yule (1996: 77) who believes that Adjacency Pairs are systematically produced in at two utterances by the speaker and the hearer respectively. Every conversation has its orderly exchange which is identified in form of acts between first and second utterances. He, then, mentioned some examples of Adjacency Pairs. They were "A: What's up?" (Question) and "B: Nothing Much" (Answer), "A: Could you help me with this?" (Request) and "B: Sure" (Accept), "A: Thanks" (Thanking) and "B: You 're welcome" (Response). All of which are interrelated but are not expected to be interchangeable. In the same line, Richards and Schmidt (1985) state that in Adjacency Pairs first utterance is always followed by second expected response which proves that both speaker and hearer have completed their turn successfully. Each particular response is preceded by a particular proposed act. For example, if the first speaker greets the hearer, then the hearer greets the first speaker.

However, an expected response does not always follow particular utterance. This means that first utterance might not be always followed by a preferred response uttered by the hearer. So, the response can be either preferred or dispreffered depending on the hearer who has another conversational objective. Preferred response (Pomerantz, 1984; Sacks, 1987) can be identified when the first pair part "makes conditionally relevant distinct alternative types of responding actions" (Schegloff and Lerner, 2009: 113). As noted that in Adjacency Pairs, a response is not only preferred second part, but also dispreferred second part. The difference between the second parts is that preferred second part is produced without delaying time, while dispreferred first part is influenced by the second speaker who hesitates and pauses expected response. Such dispreferred response does not mean that the first speaker rejects the response. Such dispreferred second pair part is a matter natural response (Schegloff, 2007; Levinson, 1983). In line with that, dispreferred second pair part is said to be reasonable in a conversation as each speaker or hearer uses different views and contexts during conversation (Yule, 1996: 77). As for the example, "request" is followed by "acceptance" (preferred) and "refusal" (dispreferred); "offer/invite" is followed by "acceptance" (preferred) and "refusal" (dispreferred); "assessment" is followed by "agreement" (accepted) and "disagreement" (dispreferred) (Fezter, 2014).

A number of research related to adjacency pairs have been conducted in term of conversational structure of adjacency pairs (Adams, 1981), dispreferred turns of adjacency pairs (Berglund, 2009; Mansouri & Mirsaeedi, 2012; Jalilifar and Dinarvand, 2013; Rendle-Short, 2015), language functions in adjacency pairs (Fitriana, 2013), adjacency pairs and consciousness (Cui, 2016), patterns of adjacency pairs (Isgianto, 2016; Permatasari & Listiyanti, 2017). However, little research has been done in term of investigating both preferred and dispreferred adjacency pairs in a multicultural movie. Therefore, this study focused on identifying both preferred and dispreferred

pairs as uttered in a multicultural movie, Lost in Translation. It enables the researcher to figure out a new focus on the study of adjacency pairs.

As the main purpose, this article investigated how the structures of Adjacency Pairs were unleashed out of utterances of every turn in the conversations as uttered in the Movie Lost in Translation. Finding out the structures of adjacency pairs help understanding the way speakers of different cultures express ideas or minds. The structures of Adjacency Pairs were determined by intention of speakers who produced an utterance and for a pattern of adjacent pairs when they took their turn. It discussed acculturation of turn taking which formed acts of speech between mixed-cultures speakers. The structures of Adjacency Pairs determined from the conversations also revealed that acts in speech vary according to speakers' response. The results enable other speakers to figure out when and why preferred and dispreferred pairs are needed during a conversation. In addition, the results also enrich understandings on how to communicate properly and based on shared knowledge of turn taking and speech acts.

Method

In this study, the researcher employed qualitative research which focuses more on deep understanding towards the concept of an object being investigated rather than analyzing data by using statistical analysis. In line with that, Hasanuddin WS (2016) states that qualitative research is concerned with "researcher's understanding towards the interaction among empirically analyzed concepts". This means that such a research has much to do with how a researcher views every event or action as empirical data that need to be investigated under acts of speech data and underlying meaning of the data.

As for the data, this study was undertaken to construct descriptive data based on the acts of speech as speakers utter during their conversations. This conversation analysis study relies on conversations of the movie script as the main source of data analysis. Conversations were oral descriptive data that contain both predictable and unpredictable structures depending on speakers' intention, importance, purpose, and influence. Every speaker in a conversation has rights to be considered as to utter appropriate acts as expected by other speakers. In this case, such acts are mostly as natural as they are uttered and the acts reflect speakers' aims and wants as each utterance continues. In addition, this study seeks to find out how speakers' habits and cultures influenced on the use of particular utterances which formulated structures of adjacency pairs of each conversation.

This qualitative study enabled the researcher to determine the structures of Adjacency Pairs as uttered all along the conversation of the movie Lost in Translation produced by Sofia Coppola. This movie was selected as it depicted acculturation of western or American and eastern or Japanese culture in term of acts in speech. It is important to find out acculturation between two different cultures as speakers from the two cultures have their own ideas of how to accentuate such differences (Fiske, 2000). Thus, it helps enhance deep understanding on they way speakers of different cultures interact in order to propose an utterance and give a response.

To collect the data, the researcher watched the movie for several times to encourage deep understanding of every utterance in conversation. Downloaded script of the movie helped to get detailed information on the use of acts and turns in the

conversations. To analyze the data, the researcher marked the conversations containing adjacent turns. Parts of turns which contain zero adjacent pairs were neglected. Then, utterances which included adjacent pairs were identified and followed by determining Adjacency Pairs from each turn. The researcher interpreted the patterns of Adjacency Pairs by interrelate the adjacent pairs with speakers' habits and cultures in which they lived in. A conclusion was made as a final step of the analysis.

Results and Discussion

The results of this study were obtained from the data of utterances in each conversation in Lost in Translation Movie script which was comprehended, categorized, formulated, and analyzed. There are two types of responses of second pair parts as included into adjacent pairs, namely preferred and dispreffered responses of Adjacency Pairs. The study revealed that twenty eight structures of Adjacency Pairs in terms of preferred responses of second pair parts were identified and formulated (Table 1). There were also fourteen structures of Adjacency Pairs which were identified as dispreferred responses of second pair parts (Table 2).

The results revealed that the structures of Adjacency Pairs as uttered in the movie Lost in Translation are more varied compared to those found in Fauzia (2015) that investigated types of Adjacency Pairs in Romeo and Juliet Movie and those in Hasan (2015) that focused on identifying structures of Adjacency Pairs in Knight and Day movie. The structures of Adjacency Pairs as identified in this study proved that communication through conversations is comprehensive that acts as produced in a conversation vary from one situation or context compared to other contexts through which such conversation occurs. The result investigated from the conversations of Lost in Translation Movie implies that the use of language between one speaker is different from that of another speaker. Moreover, it described how language is conveyed and perceived by speakers in various conversations.

The structures of Adjacency Pairs found this study were formulated based on first pair part as uttered by first speaker and second pair part as uttered by second speaker. There were two types of responses as categorized, namely preferred and dispreferred responses of Adjacency Pairs. Twenty eight structures of preferred responses and fourteen dispreferred responses were identified from the conversations of the movie and such findings were more comprehensive than those as shown in Hermansyah (2013) who found four sequences of preferred and dispreferred responses of Adjacency Pairs. The result of this study showed that there are several important implications to notice out of the structures of Adjacency Pairs.

The first implication is that acts of speech as produced in the conversations vary. As for preferred responses of Adjacency Pairs, there were twenty eight structures which proved that each speaker has their own intention, need, and interest during a their speech turn within a conversation. One of the underlying reason of the variation is habits and cultures of one or both speakers.

First, **Acknowledgement** *(Welcome to Tokyo)*, is uttered by Kawasaki, a Japanese, to Bob, an American, who replies with **Thank** *(Thank you very much)*. Shared culture of both speakers enables them to respect each other through acknowledging and thanking.

Table 1. The list of Preferred Adjacency Pairs

Type of Adjacency Pairs	Structures of Preferred Adjacency Pairs	
	First Act	**Second Act (Response)**
Preferred	Acknowledgement	Thank
	Offer	Acceptance
	Information	Thank
	Information	Acknowledgement
	Question	Answer
	Leave Taking	Leave Taking
	Request	Acceptance
	Command	Acceptance
	Promise	Acceptance
	Request	Promise
	Summon	Answer
	Greeting	Greeting
	Compliment	Acceptance
	Blame	Admission
	Assertion	Assent
	Telling	Assessment
	Invitation	Acceptance
	Challenge	Acceptance
	Permission	Acceptance
	Thanks	Acknowledgement
	Acknowledgement	Acceptance
	Assessment	Agreement
	Wish	Wish
	Agreement	Agreement
	Agreement	Thank
	Wish	Acknowledgement
	Order	Acceptance
	Wish	Thank

Second, Another structure of Adjacency Pairs is ***Information*** *(Have a nice stay with us)* which is followed by ***Thank*** *(Thank you very much).* Thanking is an appropriate way of responding to first speaker's information. The second speaker may also have another choice of responding to the act such as giving a comment on the information. Thanking for the information seems to be culturally appropriate as the second speaker respects the first speaker's act of speech.

Third, the structure ***Information*** *(My name is Kawasaki)* is followed by ***Ackowledgement*** *(I've heard about you).* The choice of preferred response, Acknowledgement, is intended to commend on the information which introduced a name. The utterance which implies Acknowledgement shows that the name has been popular and well known by a lot of people.

Table 2. The list of Dispreferred Adjacency Pairs

Type of Adjacency Pairs	Structures of Dispreferred Adjacency Pairs	
	First Act	**Second Act (Response)**
Dispreferred	Offer	Refusal
	Promise	Refusal
	Invitation	Refusal
	Suggest	Refusal
	Request	Refusal
	Assertion	Dissent
	Boasting	Derision
	Compliment	Refusal
	Command	Refusal
	Challenge	Refusal
	Assessment	Disagreement
	Summon (Inserted Summon-Inserted Answer)	Answer
	Question (Inserted Question-Inserted Answer)	Answer
	Command (Inserted Question-Inserted Answer)	Acceptance

Fourth, the structure **Command** *(Ooh, get out, guys!)* is responded by **Acceptance** *(I'm leaving).* The Adjacency Pair structure is simply identified in a conversation. What makes it unique is that the utterance which implies Acceptance allows the reader to figure out that Command does not have to be responded by "Yes" or "No" response.

Fifth, the structure **Request** *(It's just so bad for you)* is followed by **Promise** *(Well, I'll stop later)*. The Request can also be followed by Acceptance, but Promise is another proper response. Promise convinces that the second speaker strongly agrees with the Request and expects not to do the same action in the future.

Sixth, another variety is **Blame** *(Why do you have to point out how stupid everyday is all the time?)* which is followed by **Admission** *(I thought it was funny)*. The first act of speech might cause an offense if responded by the second speaker. Fortunately, Admission as implied in the second statement enables the first speaker to reduce emotion and the second speaker not to be offended.

Seventh, the structure **Assertion** *(He fought on the American side of the Bay of Pigs in Cuba)* is followed by **Assent** *(That's horrible)*. Assertion can be responded by either an inserted question or Assent. The choice of Assent is better than an inserted question as Assent allows the second speaker to simply pay attention to Assertion and respect the first speaker's act of speech.

Eighth, the structure **Order** *(Tell her I said she's gotta eat something)* is responded by **Acceptance** *(I'm just trying to get her to eat something).* One way of accepting Order is by saying "Yes" or "No". This second pair part is not selected by the second speaker. The second pair part shows that accepting Order by describing Acceptance is more appropriate compared to a mere agreement. Such description ensures the first speaker

that Acceptance is seriously and deliberately implied by the second speaker in the second pair part.

As for the second implication, it is noticed that preference of responses in the second pair part is dependable and subjective. Two types of responses in Adjacency Pairs, preferred and dipreferred responses, are psychologically dependent and illogical as each speaker has different expectation (Levinson, 1983: 336). Dispreferred structures of Adjacency Pairs are described as follows.

First, the structure **Offer** *(What can I get you?)* is followed by **Refusal** *(Um, I'm not sure).* An expected response for the first pair part is accepting an offer. However, refusing the offer is considered as an unexpected second pair part which is a dispreferred response. The first pair part, Offer, does not expect the second pair part, Refusal. As a natural conversation, such dispreferred act of speech might be commonly found between first and second utterances.

Second, the structure **Promise** *(I'm gonna talk to him)* is responded by **Refusal** *(Shut up)*. Such dispreferred second pair part is commonly uttered in a conversation by the second speaker. This response is unique that Refusal is not stated by a "No" as negation, rather the use of "Shut up" is more appropriate for the second speaker's view.

Third, the structure **Invitation** *(It is a big honor to be invited to this show)* is followed by **Refusal** *(I'am surprised and honored, but I think I need to check with my agent)*. Such choice of response is considered as a more polite response as it is declarative rather than imperative.

Fourth, the structure **Suggest** *(Well, you better get some sleep)* is responded by **Refusal** *(No, actually, they gave me off tomorrow).* This second pair part reveals that the use of negation in dispreferred second pair part is not sufficient for refusing a suggestion. The second speaker opts to describe the reason for stating a negation which makes it more prestigious.

Fifth, the structure **Assertion** *(John, John, you are my favourite photographer)* is followed by **Dissent** *(Huh? Ooh, come on)*. A praise might be responded by an assent as the first speaker ensures that the second speaker is as similar as what the utterance says. However, Assertion can also be followed by Dissent which implies that the second speaker does not agree with the praise as uttered by the first speaker.

Sixth, another dispreferred response in Adjacency Pairs is **Boasting** *(I'm doing millions interviews a day)* which is followed by **Derision** *(It's crazy)*. The first pair part shows that the speaker boasts about incredible numbers of interviews. A preferred response might be accepting the information. Dispreferred response which implies that Derision does not support Boasting is considered as an appropriate act of speech by the second speaker.

The third implication of the results in this study is that conversations consist of complex structures. Conversation is highly meaningful that it is dependent upon habits and cultures of people who have different intention during a talk (Pomerantz and Pehr, 2000). An inserted sequence, for example, goes through a conversation and allows both speakers to convince meaning. An inserted sequence, according to Yule (1996: 78), is "one adjacency pair within another". Such sequence is not only adjacent, but also complicated. To prove it, the following examples have more.

First, the structure **Summon** *(Hello?)* **(inserted Summon** *(Hello?)* **– inserted Answer** *(Hi))* **Answer** *(Hey)* enables the reader to figure out that an answer does not always

follow a summon. A summon as inserted after the first summon is identified by an inserted answer which is finally responded as an answer of the first summon. This might happen when contexts influence the conversation. Noises, unclear voices of an utterance, and complicated structures and meaning of an utterance are among the underlying factors of the structure of Adjacency Pairs.

Second, another structure is **Question** *(You know Looger More?)* which is followed by *inserted Question (Roger More?),* then followed by *inserted Answer (Yeah).* Finally, *Answer (Okay, I always think of Sean Connery, seriously)* is given. In this conversation, the problem emerges when the first speaker utters *"Looger More"* which is unpredictable for the second speaker who guests it as *"Roger More"*. Such finding is included into a problem in pronouncing a word.

Third, another complicated structure is **Command** *(Okay, close your hand please)* is inserted by **Question** *(Huh?)* and then inserted by **Answer** *(Close you hand)*. It is finally completed by **Acceptance** *(Yeah, close it)*. such structure is more complicated than that in the first two complicated structures of Adjacency Pairs as the insertion of Command – Acceptance consists of Question and Answer which are included into dispreferred responses.

This study revealed that the structure of conversation is both predictable and unpredictable which prove that such structures are dynamic and changing over time. In line with that, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) state that conversation is not static that it can be varied as speakers develop their method of producing an utterance. It means that structures of Adjacency Pairs as formulated and identified in a conversation are not similar to those figured out in another conversation. Contexts of situation have an impact on preferred and dispreferred responses of second pair parts. In addition, acts of speech as implied in each utterance are dependent upon speaker's choice and intention.

Another fact of the current study is that the second part of response which can be either preferred and dispreferred were influenced by the speakers' views in mind. Both preferred and dispreferred responses could not be interfered by the first speaker as such response relies upon the second speaker's sense. This is similar to a research by Cui (2016) who also found that second responses in adjacency pairs were merely caused by the speakers' consciousness that they tend to follow their mind. Moreover, the result shows that second part of the response is produced based on the second speaker's tendency. This implies that first pair part does go through an utterance and the second pair part is expected to be preferred. Adams (1981) found that there is always expectancy from the first speaker that the second speaker as the hearer gives expected response. This seems to be conditional as second pair part cannot be influenced by the first speaker.

As for dispreferred response, it is noted that the second speaker has intention when giving such dispreferred response. Jalilifar and Dinarvand (2013) believe that dispreferred responses are strategies performed by the second speaker that is influenced by cultures. Rendle-Short (2015), then, states that different cultures cause the second speaker to give different way of a dispreferred response. The use of tokens such as 'well', 'uhm', and 'uh' have ensured that the second speaker might show different dispreferred strategies. Another study by Mansouri and Mirsaeedi (2012) revealed that dispreferred response given by the second speaker is normal and

undpredictable. It is influenced by sociocultural factors such as cultures and language styles.

Conclusion

The structures of Adjacency Pairs as uttered in the conversations of Lost in Translation Movie are varied due to contextual and situational factors. The second pair part as a response is influenced by speaker's intention, need, habit, or culture. An intention as an act of speech emerges when a speaker tends to state that the utterance is dependent on the speaker. The second pair part is also related to speaker's need which forces the speaker to produce an utterance with a particular speech act. Habit and culture are identified as another underlying factor that influences on the preferred and dispreferred responses of Adjacency Pairs. Such habit and culture allow the second speaker to produce an utterance in terms of declarative or imperative acts. Noises, unclear voices, and complex sentence patterns are also considered as factors that have impact on producing a particular acts of speech. Furthermore, variation in Adjacency Pairs are also dynamic that one situation of a conversation is not similar to that of another conversation. In addition, a similar type of utterance such as declarative might have some meaning depending on speaker's act as in the second pair part.

Therefore, it suggested that further researchers can extend the study to a more comprehensive topic such as speech acts and adjacency pairs. In this case, the study enables the researchers to identify and enlist all types of speech acts as uttered in a movie script or a novel and identify the structures of adjacency pairs as uttered in the conversations. Also, prospective researchers can explore specific cultural factors that influence speakers from different cultural background to produce a particular utterance in a situation. As for the readers, it is suggested that the results of this study are compared to other results of similar study. It can enrich the readers' knowledge on the structures of Adjacency Pairs in various and relevant studies.

Reference

Adams, K.L. (1981). Question/answer adjacency pairs in a performance appraisal interview. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 9*(2), 72-84, DOI: 10.1080/00909888109360292

Baiat, G.E., Coler, M., Pullen, M., Tienkouw, S., & Hunyadi, L. (2013). *Multimodal analysis of "well" as a discourse marker in conversation: A pilot study*. Paper presented at 4th IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications, Budapest, Hungary.

Berglund, T.O. (2009). disrupted turn adjacency and coherence maintanence in instant messaging conversations. *Language@Internet*, *6, 1-25.*

Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men, and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Longman.

Coulthard, M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cui, Y. (2016). Adjacency pairs and interactive consciousness in Virginia Woolf's novels. *Style, 50*(2), 203-222.

Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *23*(2), 283.

Fauzia, R. (2015). *A pragmatic analysis of the adjacency pairs in the modern script of Franco Zeffirelli's Romeo and Juliet Movie*. Unpublished thesis. Yogyakarta: Faculty of Language and Arts of Yogyakarta States University.

Fetzer, A. (2014). Conceptualising discourse. In Schneider, K.P and Barron, A., *Pragmatics of discourse* (pp. 35-62). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Fiske, S. T. (2000). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the Seam between the centuries: Evolution, Culture, Mind, and Brain. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 299-322.

Fitriana, G.A. (2013). *Adjacency pairs analysis in "Red Riding Hood's" movie*. Unpublished thesis. Surakarta: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.

Garcia, A. (1991). Dispute resolution without disputing: How the interactional organization of mediation hearings minimizes argument. *American Sociological Review*, 818-835.

Hagoort, P., & Meyer, A. S. (2013). What belongs together goes together: The speaker-hearer perspective. a Commentary on Macdonald's PDC Account. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*, 228. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00228

Hasan, F. (2015). *Adjacency pairs in "Knight and Day" movie*. Unpublished thesis. Surabaya: Faculty of Letters and Humanities of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Hasanuddin WS. (2016). The intangible cultural heritage of Minangkabau traditional expressions: The local wisdom of the society in advising and noble advicing. *Humanus*, *15*(2), 131-141.

Hermansyah, M. (2014). *Preferred and dispreferred responses in the dialogues of junior high school's electronic English books*. Surabaya: Faculty of Humanities of Airlangga University.

Isgianto, L. (2016). *The adjacency pairs analysis on 'Six Minutes English' conversation script of BBC Learning English: A Study of Discourse Analysis*. Paper presented at International Seminar Prasasti III: Current Research in Linguistics, Solo.

Jalilifar, A.R., & Dinarvand, R. (2013). An analysis of Iranian EFL Learners' dis-preferred responses in interactional discourse. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, *5*(1), 19-44.

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

Mansouri, S. & Mirsaeedi, A. (2012). *Application of Levinson concept of dispreferred seconds to the review of Iranian high school English textbooks*. Paper presented at International Conference on Economics Marketing and Management, 28, Singapore.

Oreström, B. (1983). *Turn-taking in English conversation* (66). Krieger Pub Co.

Permatasari, I., & Listiyanti. (2017). Adjacency pairs in drama script "Teen Angel" by D.M Larson. *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies (ADJES), 4*(2), 13-20.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A., & Pehr. B.J. (2000). *Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Rendle-Short, J. (2015). Dispreferred responses when texting: Delaying that 'No' response. *Discourse & Communication, 9*(6), 643-661.

Richards, J.C., &, Schmidt, R.W. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J.R.E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 54-69). Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E.A., and Sacks, H. (1973). Openings and closings. *Semiotica*, *7,* 289-327.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., & Lerner, G. H. (2009). Beginning to respond: Well-prefaced responses to wh-questions. *Research On Language And Social Interaction*, *42*(2), 91–115.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.