

---

## **AN ANALYSIS OF ADJACENCY PAIRS IN *PURPLE HEARTS* (2022) FILM**

**Putri Nabilah P<sup>1\*</sup>, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1\*</sup> English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences,  
Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences,  
Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia

Pos-el: putrinabilahp04@gmail.com<sup>1\*</sup>, famalaekasanhadi@fib.unmul.ac.id<sup>2</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

This research focuses on the use of adjacency pairs in the dialogue of *Purple Hearts* (2022) film. It applies Hutchby and Wooffitt's theory of Conversation Analysis as the main framework. The purpose of this study is to identify how adjacency pairs are employed in the dialogue and to describe the types of adjacency pairs used in the film. The data consist of selected conversations between the main characters, Cassie Salazar and Luke Morrow, which were examined using a qualitative descriptive method. The findings show that twelve types of adjacency pairs appear throughout the film, including Greeting-Greeting, Summons-Answer, Apology-Minimization, Question-Answer, Request, Offer, Blame, Assessment, Command, Assertion, Suggestion, and Announcement-Acknowledgement. Among these, Question-Answer and Assessment-Agreement/Disagreement were found to be the most frequently occurring types. These adjacency pairs not only structure the conversation but also reveal the characters' relationship dynamics and emotional development. In *Purple Hearts*, adjacency pairs play an essential role in expressing conflict, affection, and cooperation between the two main characters. The study shows that adjacency pairs serve as a key element in understanding how language reflects intimacy and emotional growth in interpersonal communication.

**Keywords:** Adjacency Pairs, Conversation Analysis, *Purple Hearts*, Film

### **ABSTRAK**

Penelitian ini berfokus pada penggunaan adjacency pairs dalam dialog film *Purple Hearts* (2022). Penelitian ini menggunakan teori Conversation Analysis dari Hutchby dan Wooffitt sebagai kerangka utama. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi bagaimana adjacency pairs digunakan dalam dialog serta mendeskripsikan jenis-jenis adjacency pairs yang muncul dalam film tersebut. Data

**Putri Nabilah P, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu**  
An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) Film

penelitian diambil dari percakapan antara dua tokoh utama, Cassie Salazar dan Luke Morrow, yang dianalisis menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat dua belas jenis *adjacency pairs* yang muncul dalam film, yaitu *Greeting-Greeting*, *Summons-Answer*, *Apology-Minimization*, *Question-Answer*, *Request*, *Offer*, *Blame*, *Assessment*, *Command*, *Assertion*, *Suggestion*, dan *Announcement-Acknowledgement*. Di antara jenis-jenis tersebut, *Question-Answer* serta *Assessment-Agreement/Disagreement* merupakan tipe yang paling sering muncul. *Adjacency pairs* dalam film ini tidak hanya berfungsi sebagai struktur percakapan, tetapi juga menggambarkan dinamika hubungan, perkembangan emosional, serta negosiasi kekuasaan antara kedua tokoh utama. Dalam *Purple Hearts*, *adjacency pairs* memiliki peran penting dalam mengekspresikan konflik, kasih sayang, dan kerja sama antara Cassie dan Luke. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa *adjacency pairs* merupakan elemen penting dalam memahami bagaimana bahasa mencerminkan keintiman dan pertumbuhan emosional dalam komunikasi interpersonal.

**Kata Kunci:** *Adjacency Pairs, Conversation Analysis, Film, Purple Hearts*

## A. INTRODUCTION

Conversation is a fundamental aspect of human communication. It serves as the medium through which individuals exchange ideas, express emotions, and build relationships. According to Baiat et al. (2013) and Hagoort & Meyer (2013), effective communication requires both speaker and listener to play distinct yet complementary roles. The speaker's task is to deliver information, while the listener interprets and responds, creating an organized exchange of utterances. These utterances form structured interactions that reflect how meaning is jointly constructed in discourse. One of the key frameworks for understanding the organization of talk is Conversation Analysis (CA), which focuses on how participants coordinate and manage turns in interaction. Within CA, *adjacency pairs* are among the most basic yet crucial structures in conversation. As explained by Latin (2009), *adjacency pairs* consist of two utterances produced by different speakers in immediate sequence, such as a question and an answer, or a greeting and a response, demonstrating the cooperative and rule-governed nature of human communication. While *adjacency pairs* originate in natural spoken discourse, they can also be observed in film dialogues, since films are artistic representations of human interaction.

Dialogue in films mirrors everyday communication and often reflects social, emotional, and psychological dynamics between characters. Therefore, analyzing *adjacency pairs* in film dialogue not only reveals how conversations are constructed

Putri Nabilah P, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu  
An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) Film

but also how relationships and character development unfold on screen. This study focuses on adjacency pairs in the film *Purple Hearts* (2022), directed by Elizabeth Allen Rosenbaum. The romantic drama follows Luke Morrow (Nicholas Galitzine), a U.S. Marine, and Cassie Salazar (Sophia Carson), an aspiring musician, who enter a marriage of convenience to meet personal and financial needs. Despite their contrasting personalities and worldviews, their conversations reveal emotional tension, vulnerability, and gradual transformation from conflict to affection. By examining adjacency pairs in the dialogue between Cassie and Luke, this research aims to explore how conversational exchanges contribute to relationship development and character portrayal in the film. The analysis demonstrates how adjacency pairs organize discourse, shape interactional meaning, and reflect deeper social and emotional dimensions. Moreover, applying Conversation Analysis to film data allows for the study of scripted talk that imitates real-life communication, bridging linguistic structures and cinematic storytelling. This study is expected to provide both theoretical and practical insights into how adjacency pairs function within film dialogue. Theoretically, it contributes to the broader understanding of conversational structures and their roles in narrative construction. Practically, it offers a reference for future research on film discourse and encourages readers to apply the concept of adjacency pairs in analyzing communication both in media and everyday contexts.

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Film and literature share a close interrelationship, as both serve as forms of storytelling that express human experience through language and representation. As Klarer (2013) notes, film though primarily visual can be viewed as a semi-textual form influenced by literary and linguistic structures. Through its integration of visual imagery, sound, and dialogue, film functions as a textual medium that conveys meaning much like literary works. Consequently, linguistic approaches such as Conversation Analysis (CA) are highly relevant in studying film dialogue, as films simulate natural spoken interaction. Conversation Analysis, often defined as the study of “talk in interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008), examines how participants produce and interpret utterances in real-time communication. It focuses on structures such as turn-taking, sequence organization, and repair mechanisms, which ensure smooth conversational flow. Among these structures, adjacency pairs two consecutive utterances produced by different speakers play a central role in maintaining coherence and interactional order (Richards & Schmidt, 1985; Yule, 1996). Each first part of an adjacency pair for example question, greeting, or request creates an expectation for a corresponding second part answer, return greeting, or acceptance, highlighting the reciprocal and collaborative nature of conversation. According to Partlidge (2003), adjacency pairs reflect how speakers align with one

**Putri Nabilah P, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu**  
An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) Film

another, showing agreement, disagreement, acceptance, or refusal in socially meaningful ways. These interactional patterns can also be found in film dialogues, where characters’ exchanges are intentionally structured to mirror authentic human communication. By analyzing adjacency pairs, researchers can uncover how filmmakers use dialogue not only to advance the plot but also to express relationships, power dynamics, and emotional subtext.

## C. METHODS

This study uses a qualitative descriptive method with a conversation analysis approach to explore how the main characters in *Purple Hearts* (2022) interact with other characters and use various styles of language. Qualitative descriptive research emphasizes the exploration of phenomena in their natural settings and strives to capture the richness and complexity of human experiences without relying on existing theoretical frameworks (Creswell, 2016). In this study, the data consists of dialogues from the film *Purple Hearts* (2022), which was released on July 29, 2022, by Alloy Entertainment and Netflix through Embankment Films, with the researcher themselves as the main instrument who designs, collects, analyzes, and interprets the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Moleong, 2018). The data collection process involves watching the film carefully, taking a note of the conversations, paying attention to matching pairs, and capturing relevant scenes. While the analysis follows the framework of Miles and Huberman (1994), which includes data reduction, data display, and conclusion verification to ensure that the findings are processed systematically and accurately answer the research questions.

## D. FINDINGS

Conversation analysis is a systematic study of talk-in-interaction, which refers to a methodical examination of human communication in everyday contexts. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), it is a technical study of human speech that focuses on how interactions are organized and understood. As a comprehensive approach to the study of communication, conversation analysis emphasizes both the basic structure of conversations and the subtle nuances of interpersonal interactions. One of its main concerns is the structure of talk, particularly the turn-taking process, which plays a crucial role in conveying meaning and maintaining listener engagement. Within this framework, utterances are viewed as sequentially organized units, where speakers and listeners participate in a coordinated exchange. This exchange is most clearly seen in adjacency pairs where the first expression sets expectations for the second, creating meaningful and coherent interactions. In this research, the analysis focuses on how adjacency pairs are structured and

**Putri Nabilah P, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu**  
An Analysis of Adjacency Pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) Film

employed in the dialogue and what types of adjacency pairs used in the film of *purple hearts* (2022).

## 1. Greeting – Greeting

This type of adjacency pairs occurs when one speaker tries to introduce themselves or to make the conversation with the others (Yule, 1996).

Data 1

Luke : *Hi*

Cassie : *Hi*

Luke : *Thanks for meeting with me*

In this scene, Luke and Cassie meet at a cafe after a series of complicated events, previously Cassie had visited her best friend Frankie’s house with the intention of proposing marriage. Cassie told Frankie that if they get married, they could gain several benefits, including money and health insurance. This was important to her because she had recently been diagnosed with type 1 diabetes and needed insulin, which she couldn’t afford due to its high cost. As Cassie explained her plan to Frankie, Luke, who happened to be at Frankie house overheard their conversation. Luke interrupted, warning them that such an agreement would be considered fraud against the government. Cassie feeling attacked, responded angrily, rejecting Luke opinion. Frankie then mediates, apologizing to Cassie and admitting that he cannot marry her because he is already in a relationship. Hearing this Cassie leaves, saying that she will find a way. A few days later, Luke get into trouble with debt collectors because of his addiction in the past. Without money and without a clear solution, Luke suddenly remembers Cassie’s previous plan. In desperation, he contacted Cassie and asked to meet to discuss the possibility of a fake marriage together. The dialogue between Luke and Cassie in the cafe begins with a simple “*Hi*”. This small word functions as a greeting and serves as the opening to their conversation. In terms of adjacency pairs, “*Hi*” is part of a greeting-greeting exchange, where one person offers a greeting and expects the other to respond in kind.

## 2. Summons – Answer

This type of adjacency pairs occurs when the speaker and the listener are in a different locations. This kind is typically heard over the phone. When the phone calls occur during the talks, there is a summons (Yule, 1996).

Data 2

Luke : *Can you see me?*

Cassie : *Yeah, can you see me?*

Luke : *Uh yeah, yeah.*



In this dialogue Luke and Cassie are not in the same places. After planning and agreeing to a fake marriage, they are officially married but living apart because Luke is on duty out of town. To keep up appearances and avoid suspicion from Luke’s colleagues, they make video calls part of their daily routine, during the calls, Luke begins by asking, “can you see me?” Cassie immediately replies, “Yes, can you see me?” this brief exchange shows distance between them is overcome through technology. Luke’s question serve as a summons, not only checking the connection but also Cassie’s presence on the answer. Cassie’s response mirror his words, serving as an answer to his summons. This pair of utterances falls into the category of adjacency pairs, specifically summons-answer. Although simple, this routine of question and answer highlights both their physical separation and their efforts to maintain the impression of closeness. It shows that even basic exchanges like checking visibility serve as reminders that they are in different places.

### 3. Apology – Minimization

This type occurs when someone does something incorrectly and want to apologize, this kind of adjacency pairs is used. The speaker in this exchange apologizes to someone, but they downplay their apology to the audience (Yule, 1996).

Data 3

Luke : *Hey, I just wanted to apologize for our friend. He's a bit...*

Cassie : *Okay*

In this scene, Cassie is working at the bar when Frankie arrives with his friends, who are also marines. Among them is Luke, who meets Cassie for the first time. Frankie introduces his friends, and the group starts chatting and joking around. However, the mood changes when one of the marines makes a joke that offends Cassie. Feeling uncomfortable, Cassie immediately leaves the group, walking away from Frankie and the others. Seeing this, Luke decides to approach Cassie himself. Wanting to make up for his friend's mistake, he says, “*Hey, I just want to apologize for my friend's behavior. He's a little...*” Luke's words here serve as an apology, an attempt to defuse the awkward moment and show consideration for Cassie's feelings. Cassie replied briefly, “*Okay.*” Cassie's response was short and avoided further involvement, indicating that she did not want to prolong the issue. This brief response served as minimization, defusing the offense and ending the interaction without conflict. This exchange illustrates the adjacency pair of apology-minimization. Luke takes the first step by apologizing, and Cassie provides the expected paired response, not by accepting warmly, but by minimizing the situation.

## 4. Question – Answer

This type occurs when a person responds to a question that the speaker wants to ask. The speaker’s goal in this exchange is to learn more from the listener. However, the listener may give an expected response or a surprising response to the speakers question (Yule, 1996).

Data 5

Cassie : *So, are we out of "if" territory? are we doing this?*

Luke : *Yeah, we're doing this.*

From the scene above, Cassie and Luke meet at a cafe to discuss their plans for the fake marriage. During the conversation, Cassie seeks clarity about their decision by asking, “*So, are we out of "if" territory? are we doing this?*” Her question reflects doubt and the need for confirmation from Luke. Luke responds directly, saying, “*Yeah, we are doing this.*” His answer shows certainty and provides the reassurance Cassie is looking for. This brief exchange highlights the adjacency pairs question-answer. Cassie begins by asking, and Luke complements the pair by providing a clear answer.

## 5. Acceptance/Refusal of Request

This type occurs when someone is asked for something and then accepts or rejects, this is the statement that is made by the individual.

Data 19

Luke : *Could you throw in some lemon slices with that?*

Cassie : *How about you pace yourself, bro?*

In this scene, Cassie is working at the bar when Frankie, her best friend, arrives with a group of friends. Among them is Luke, and this moment marks Cassie's first meeting with him. As part of her job, Cassie takes their orders one by one. When it’s Luke's turn, he orders a glass of cola and makes a special request, saying, “*Could you throw in some lemon slices with that?*” Instead of responding directly, Cassie replies sarcastically, “*How about you pace yourself, bro?*” This exchange falls into the category of adjacency pairs, specifically Acceptance/Refusal of Request. Luke's sentence is a request because Luke asks if Cassie can add a slice of lemon to his drink and Cassie's response serves as the second part of the pair. However, her response is neither a direct acceptance nor a clear refusal; it is a sarcastic comment that indirectly opposes Luke's request. The use of humor softens the rejection.

## 6. Acceptance/Refusal of Offer

This kind happens when someone offers to do something. Someone's answer or feedback in these adjacency pairs could include accepting or rejecting the offer.

Data 16

Luke : *You don't look great, cas. You okay?*

Cassie : *No, i'm fine*

Luke : *When was the last time you ate?*

Cassie : *I don't know*

Luke : *Hang on to me*

Cassie : *Okay*

In this dialogue, Cassie looks visibly weak and pale after performing on stage, which worries Luke. He asks, “*You don't look great, Cas. You okay?*” showing his concern. Cassie replies with “*No, I'm fine,*” trying to downplay her condition. Luke continues asking questions to confirm her well-being, “*When was the last time you ate?*” to which Cassie admits she doesn't know. Luke then offers physical support by saying, “*Hang on to me,*” and Cassie responds with “*Okay.*” This exchange can be categorized as an Offer-Acc/Ref of adjacency pairs, because Luke offers Cassie to hang on to him and Cassie accepts it.

## 7. Blame-Admission/Denial

This kind of adjacency pairs occurs when the speaker blames something on someone, then she/he might be denied or admitted to the speaker's blame.

Data 21

Luke : *You've got to be kidding me, cassie. What were you thinking? we are totally screwed. I told you he was a military police*

Cassie : *You failed to mention your dad and your brother have the same frickin' name, luke. It's fine It's fine.*

Luke : *It's not fine.*

From the scene above, previously, Cassie received a call from one of Luke's co-workers, who tells her that Luke was injured while on duty. Shocked and panicked, Cassie remembers Luke's instructions that if anything happens to him, she must contact his older brother and tell him about their agreement but she must not tell Luke's father. Following his words, Cassie goes to find Luke's brother, but when she arrives at the house, it is Luke's father who opens the door. With no other choice, Cassie tells him about Luke's situation. When Luke later found out that Cassie had spoken to his father, he became angry. He blamed Cassie, saying, “*You've got to be kidding me, Cassie. what were you thinking?*”



*we are totally screwed. I told you he was a military police.” Cassie retaliated and shifted the blame onto Luke, replying, “You failed to mention your dad and your brother have the same frickin' name, Luke. It's fine it's fine.” She said that instead of admitting her mistake, Cassie refuses to take responsibility and insists that everything will be fine, even though Luke disagrees by saying that they will not be fine. This exchange illustrates the adjacency pair blame-admission/denial. Luke initiates this pair by accusing Cassie, expecting her to either admit her mistake or deny it. Cassie completes the sequence by denying the accusation and turning it back on Luke.*

## 8. Assessment-Agreement/Disagreement

This type occurs when speakers make these statements to convey their feelings, opinions, judgment, viewpoints, or assessments about many things, including people, events, or objects. There may be agreement or disagreement with the utterance responses.

Data 43

Cassie : *I see how hard you've been working at it, and you'll run again, luke. I believe in you*

Luke : .... [hold her hands]

Based on the scene above, Cassie expresses admiration and faith in Luke's recovery, saying, “*I see how hard you've been working at it, and you'll run again, Luke. I believe in you.*” Her words serve as an assessment, evaluating Luke's progress positively and offering emotional encouragement. Luke responds nonverbally by holding her hands, signaling gratitude and agreement with her statement. This interaction represents an Assessment-Agreement adjacency pairs, where Cassie's supportive evaluation is acknowledged through Luke's affectionate gesture. The silence and physical touch convey mutual understanding and emotional intimacy, highlighting how their relationship has transformed from a contractual arrangement into genuine care and love.

## 9. Command-Compliance/Incompliance

This kind of adjacency pairs occurs when the speaker tries to get the listener to perform an action the listener may respond with compliance or incompliance.

Data 35

Cassie : *In fact, i pinky swear*

Luke : *No, i'm not doing that*

Cassie : *We're getting married, man*

Luke : [inhales deeply] [exhales] [do the pinky swear]

From the scene above, after promising to keep their secret, Cassie playfully adds, “*In fact, I pinky swear,*” attempting to lighten the mood. Cassie held out her pinky finger to Luke and told him to do a pinky swear with her. Luke initially refuses, saying, “*No, I’m not doing that,*” but after Cassie insists reminding him they are “getting married” he finally gives in and joins her in the pinky swear. This scene illustrates a Command-Compliance adjacency pairs in a humorous and affectionate tone. Cassie’s playful command carries emotional persuasion rather than authority, and Luke’s eventual compliance shows his willingness to participate in her symbolic gesture.

## 10. Acceptance/Refusal of Suggestions

This statement was made by the public to offer suggestions for a topic of discussion. It’s possible that the suggestions will be accepted or rejected.

Data 41

Cassie : *Why don't you have another choice?*

Luke : *How's that your business?*

In this scene, Luke and Cassie are at a cafe discussing their fake marriage plan. Previously, Luke overheard Frankie and Cassie's conversation about marrying just for money and health insurance, arguing that it was the same as fraud the government. However, now Luke himself wants to marry Cassie to get money to pay off his debts, even though he is very afraid of getting caught. In their conversation, Cassie questions Luke's decision and suggests that he find another way, saying, “*Why don't you have another choice?*” Luke responds sarcastically and refuses, saying, “*How's that your business?*” This exchange falls under the category of the Acceptance/refusal of suggestions adjacency pairs, where Cassie suggest Luke to look for other options and Luke refuses to accept it.

## 11. Assertion-Agreement/Disagreement

This type of adjacency pairs occurs when the speaker makes a statement to someone in these kinds of adjacency pairs. The message may then lead to agreement or disagreement as a reaction.

Data 42

Luke : *That's crazy! You.. You're doing the damn thing.*

Luke : *Wait, so does this mean that i'm, like, your muse? no?*

Cassie : *Really? let me think about it. Okay, maybe just a little.*

Luke : *Good luck at the concert. Bye.*

In this data, Luke and Cassie are on a video call. Cassie talks about her daily life and her job as a singer. She tells Luke that she has written a song for him and his fellow marines. After finishing the song, Cassie uploads a demo of it online, and unexpectedly, the song goes viral. This success leads to Cassie and her band being invited to perform at a big concert. Hearing this news, Luke is surprised and expresses his support for her. As the mood becomes more relaxed, Luke teases Cassie jokingly, “*Wait, so does this mean that I’m, like, your muse? No?*” His words were not just a joke but also a statement that positioned him as Cassie’s source of inspiration. Cassie reacted with a bit of shyness. Instead of rejecting it outright, she replied, “*Really? Let me think about it. Okay, maybe just a little*” Her response showed that she was a bit shy but willing to agree with Luke’s statement. This moment illustrates how their interaction falls into a pattern of assertion-agreement. Luke claims his role as Cassie’s source of inspiration, and Cassie, though hesitant, accepts his words in a playful manner. This exchange highlights the closeness of their relationship; Luke’s light teasing and Cassie’s gentle approval reveal the warmth and intimacy between them.

## 12. Announcement-Acknowledgement

Adjacency pairs of this kind include a person sharing information with another and making something public. Either compliance or noncompliance may be shown by the responses

Data 12

Luke : *No one told you?*

Cassie : *What?*

Luke : *Frankie, he’s, um... the same mission as this. He, uh...*

*He didn’t make it, Cassie.*

Cassie : *No.*

Luke : *I’m sorry, i-*

Cassie : *I can’t be here.*

In this scene, Cassie and Luke were in a long-distance relationship when suddenly one day Cassie was contacted by Luke’s coworker who informed her that Luke had an accident while on duty, which left him unable to walk and required him to undergo rehab for some time, as well as use a wheelchair. When hearing that information, Cassie panicked and rushed to inform Luke’s sibling but ended up contacting his father instead and had to tell him about Luke’s condition, which made Luke very angry. Being in this situation made Cassie feel that if her friend Frankie knew about it, he would probably find it very funny. Hearing Cassie mention Frankie’s name surprised Luke, and he asked Cassie if no one had told her about her friend’s condition And Cassie panicked

while waiting for Luke to continue his words, then Luke told Cassie what happened by saying, "*Frankie, he's, um... the same mission as this. He, uh... he didn't make it, Cassie.*" At that moment, Cassie just found out what happened to her friend and it made her very sad. In this conversation, it can be seen that they performed one type of adjacency pairs, Announcement-Acknowledgement, because Luke announces bad news and Cassie reacts emotionally, acknowledging the message.

## E. DISCUSSION

Based on the findings and analysis that have been presented above, it is clearly that the two main characters, Luke Morrow and Cassie Salazar, are involved in each of the twelve different forms of adjacency pairs that occur over the entirety of the film *Purple Hearts* (2022). The different levels of intimacy between the characters reflect the natural, dynamic, and emotionally rich conversations that occur between the two main characters as they experience moments of conflict, humor, affection, and personal growth. The analysis demonstrates that their interactions are not restricted to simple verbal exchanges rather, they also include non-verbal aspects according to Paltridge (2008), listener feedback can be conveyed verbally as well as non-verbally, such as through nodding, eye contact, or body language. Non-verbal responses can also complement adjacency pairs when they clearly function as the second part of the exchange. For the example, in data 43 Luke hold Cassie's hand instead of answering to her assessment signaling gratitude and agreement with her statement (Ferch, 2016). These features function as responses that complement the sequence of adjacency pairs. This is despite the fact that adjacency pairs are traditionally described as verbal exchanges. This perspective is consistent with the more general techniques of Conversation Analysis, which acknowledge the significance of multimodal communication as an essential component of interaction processes (Meredith, 2019).

After conducting an analysis of the data, the researcher discovered twelve different types of adjacency pairs that were utilized by two main characters. These pairs included Greeting-Greeting, Summons-Answer, Apology-Minimization, Question-Answer, Request, Offer, Blame, Assesment, Command, Assertion, Announcement-Acknowledgement, and Suggestion. Regarding these, the Question-Answer and Assesment-Agreement/Disagreement is the most types that researcher found in the data. Typically, this style demonstrates how the characters are trying to gain clarification, express their interest, and makes statement to convey their feelings, opinion, judgements and viewpoints (Kim et al., 2022; Dykema et al., 2022). As their relationship grows, these exchanges usually occur during moments of tension, disagreement, or affection. As in data 24 Luke and Cassie argue Luke asseses the situation from a defensive and partriotic standpoint while Cassie firmly disagrees, challenging his tolerance of racism this data show a tension

and disagreement between two main characters where Luke statement met with Cassie opposing view and in data 32 Cassie confesses her feelings to Luke and Luke does the same for her they demonstrate the affection where Cassie's heartfelt confession is reciprocated by Luke's direct acceptance and emotional affirmation. Request, Command, Suggestion and Offer are examples of types that can be found in circumstances where working together and taking action are most importance (Mattessich & Johnson, 2018). Luke frequently assumes the role of the commanding one, while Cassie's reactions highlight her independence and strength.

These examples depict the negotiation of power and emotion that takes place between Cassie and Luke. Apology and Blame, on the other hand, illustrate instances of regret and accountability, illustrating how conflict and forgiveness affect their relationship (Knight, 2018). Greeting-Greeting, Summons-Answer, and Announcement are examples of other forms of greetings that are used during transitions between events or situations. These greetings represent shifts in tone, ranging from formal to more personal, or from casual to deeply emotional (Ali & Ansari, 2025; Marmorstein et al., 2023). When it comes to adjacency pairs, silence or gestures are frequently used rather than words (Paltridge, 2008). As an illustration, Luke's nod or Cassie's hand-holding effectively function as acknowledgment and agreement, providing a sense of closeness and emotional resonance that goes beyond what can be spoken through physical language (Acheson, 2008).

These adjacency pairs are essential in *Purple Hearts* because they highlight the emotional nuances and unspoken understanding that exist between Luke and Cassie. These features are what define their connection as it develops from that of strangers to that of partners and, finally, to that of lovers. In conclusion, the adjacency pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) serve well as a conversational structure and narrative tool. Adjacency pairs help organize interactions while also illustrating character development, from relationships based on necessity to relationships built on genuine affection and understanding.

## F. CONCLUSION

This study aims to analyze the conversations between Luke and Cassie in the film *Purple Hearts* (2022) with a focus on adjacency pairs. The result shows that various types of adjacency pairs appear throughout the film; these adjacency pairs not only organize the dialogue but also reflect the development of Luke and Cassie's relationship. At the beginning of the story, the adjacency pairs emphasize sarcasm, conflict, and distrust. However, as the plot progresses, they increasingly reveal intimacy, support, and affection. This shows that adjacency pairs are dynamic and can illustrate how characters' emotions and relationships change over time. In conclusion, the adjacency pairs in *Purple Hearts* (2022) serve well as a conversational structure and narrative tool. Adjacency pairs help organize



interactions while also illustrating character development, from relationships based on necessity to relationships built on genuine affection and understanding.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, Z., & Ansari, A. A. (2025). Why saying “Hi” can be complicated: Participation frameworks in Real-World encounters. In SP Publications & International Journal of English and Studies (IJOES), *International Journal of English and Studies* (IJOES), 7(7), p. 681. <https://doi.org/10.47311/IJOES.2025.18.07.688>
- 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. In 2013 IEEE 4th International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications (CogInfoCom), 283–288. <https://doi.org/10.1109/coginfocom.2013.6719257>
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1997). *Qualitative research for education*. MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- DiDomenico, S. M., Raclaw, J., & Robles, J. S. (2018). Attending to the mobile text summons: Managing multiple communicative activities across physically copresent and technologically mediated interpersonal interactions. *Communication Research*, 47(5), 669–700. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218803537>
- Dykema, J., Schaeffer, N. C., Garbarski, D., Assad, N., & Blixt, S. (2022). Towards a reconsideration of the use of agree-disagree questions in measuring subjective evaluations. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 18(2), 2335–2344.
- Fine, K. (2018). Compliance and command ii, imperatives and deontics. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 11(4), 634–664.
- Foley, K. I. (2023). Adapting the classics: Making the invisible visible.
- Frankfurt, H. (2018). *Alternate possibilities and moral responsibility*. In *Moral responsibility and alternative possibilities* (pp. 17–25). Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and Responses. *Language in Society*, 5(3), 257–313. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166887>
- Herr, A. (2016). Deconstructing the So-called Silent Assent: The Chain of Command, Compensated Compliance, and Resistance. In *The Holocaust and Compensated Compliance in Italy: Fossoli di Carpi, 1942–1952* (pp. 69–89). Palgrave Macmillan US.

- Hine, D. W., Kormos, C., & Marks, A. D. (2016). Agree to disagree. *Research Methods for Environmental Psychology*, 71.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity.
- Kim, N., Htut, P. M., Bowman, S. R., & Petty, J. (2022). \$^2\$: Question Answering with Questionable Assumptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10003*.
- King, M. (2020). Attending to blame. In *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 177(5), 1423–1439.
- Klarer, M. (2013). *An introduction to literary studies*. Routledge.
- Licoppe, C. (2017). Skype appearances, multiple greetings and ‘coucou’ The sequential organization of video-mediated conversation openings. *Pragmatics*, 27(3), 351-386.
- Marmorstein, M., Koivisto, A., Vepsäläinen, H., & Virtanen, M. T. (2023). Why say ‘hi’?: Framed openings in Hebrew WhatsApp messaging. *Conversation Analytic perspectives to digital interaction: practices, resources, and affordances*, 43-69.
- Miles, M. B. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks.
- Mires, E. C. (2016). *Determining the presence of misrecognition in multilingual organizations* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of the Rockies).
- Moleong, J., L. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosda Karya.
- O’Brien, R., Beeke, S., Pilnick, A., Goldberg, S. E., & Harwood, R. H. (2020). When people living with dementia say ‘no’: Negotiating refusal in the acute hospital setting. *Social Science & Medicine*, 263, 113188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113188>
- Ozuru, Y., Mock, K., Bowie, D., & Kaufman, G. (2015). Why do people disagree with a statement they do not understand? Relations between comprehension and evaluation of a simple assertion. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 27(6), 755–770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20445911.2015.1024681>
- Paltridge, B. (2014). *An Introduction Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edition. In Bloomsbury. 2(2).
- Restall, G. (2015). Assertion, denial, accepting, rejecting, symmetry, and paradox. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 310–321). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198715696.003.0011>
- Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistic*. Longman.
- Schraub, D. (2019). Deliberation and dismissal. *U. Pa. J. Const. L.*, 22, 1319.
- Snedegar, J. (2023). Dismissing blame. *J. Ethics & Soc. Phil.*, 26, 469.
- Sommers, R., & Bohns, V. K. (2018). The voluntariness of voluntary consent: Consent searches and the psychology of compliance. *Yale LJ*, 128, 1962.
- Wojatzki, M., Zesch, T., Mohammad, S., & Kiritchenko, S. (2018). Agree or disagree: Predicting judgments on nuanced assertions. In *Proceedings of the*

*Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics* (pp. 214-224). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/S18-2026>

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