

Adam PLUSZCZYK

University of Silesia

adam.pluszczyk@us.edu.pl

A STUDY OF ADJACENCY PAIRS IN THE FILM “TED”: THE CASE OF DISPREFERRED SECONDS USED FOR A HUMOROUS EFFECT

Abstract: The purpose of the article is to concentrate on the identification of those linguistic features which are allegedly typical of dispreferred second parts. There will be 12 instances analyzed where the adjacency pairs will include the dispreferred second parts. Moreover, the intention is to shed light on some positive aspects of the dispreferred second parts (dispreferred seconds) and attempt to demonstrate that in certain contexts the occurrence of the dispreferred second parts is justified or even necessary to achieve a special effect. In other words, the so called dispreferred seconds (second parts) will be analyzed from a different perspective - it will be demonstrated that the occurrence of the dispreferred second parts does not necessarily have to be perceived negatively. What is more, the presented utterances in the dispreferred second part parts will even contribute to achieving a humorous effect.

Key words: adjacency pairs, dispreferred second parts, conversation analysis, humour, film “Ted”, “Ted 2”

1. Introduction

A communicative exchange is characterized by the occurrence of *pairs* where the utterance of one speaker evokes a certain response by the other speaker participating in the conversation (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). The two utterances (a pair) produced by two successive speakers are related to each other - there is a logical connection between them. In other words, the first part of the utterance evokes some expectations on the part of the first speaker and thus the occurrence of the second part. Therefore, an *adjacency pair* (as a type of turn-taking) constitutes the basic structural unit in a conversation and is composed of two turns produced by different interlocutors where the two utterances are placed next to each other – in which the second utterance

is dependent on one and logically connected with the first one (also known as the concept of *nextness*) (Nordquist, 2017) and always constitutes a particular response such as invitation – acceptance or refusal. For instance:

First Part: It's a closed book to me. Would you please explain that to me? Second Part: Sure thing.

First Part: Want some beer? Second Part: Sure / Yes, please

First Part: Can you help me with the luggage? Second Part: Sure / Of course / Yes, I can.

According to Malmkjaer (2006), adjacency pairs are composed of two pair parts in a sequence where the second pair part shows relevance on the first one. Additionally, a first part (the first turn) sets up some expectations of a relevant second part (second turn). Thus, “the first part of an adjacency pair not only makes one of a set of type-fitted second parts relevant in next turn, but typically displays a preference for one of them” (Schegloff, 1979, p. 36). Hence, the various patterns of both preferred and dispreferred structures, such as an invitation – acceptance/refusal, an offer – acceptance/ declination, a request – acceptance/refusal, etc. (Yule, 1996, p. 79, following Levinson 1983), which one can observe in the following examples:

First Part: I hope that you will pass the final exams. Second Part: I hope so too.

Undeniably, the response which we get is expected to be positive. However, not every response (the second turn) is always preferred or “desired” as there are a number of responses which are against our expectations or predictions and thus are regarded as *dispreferred* (*dispreferreds*) although they are relevant or associated with the first pair part. Hence, the utterance in a first pair part does not always evoke a preferred response in a second pair part. As a result, the dispreferred second parts/dispreferred seconds are usually regarded as negative, but we must stress the fact that the degree of (im)politeness depends on how elaborate the response would be (taking into consideration brevity, which is reflected in the short response “No” or verbosity, where apart from the rejection/decline there is also an account or an explanation for the reason of the rejection) and also what social distance there is between the interlocutors, what relation they are in and the formality of the situation which has to do with being direct, etc., which can be observed in the following examples given below:

First Part: Maybe we could grab some food. Second Part: I'm not hungry. Some other time.

First Part: Would you like to go out with me? Second Part: No.

First Part: Will you help me? Second Part: No. I'm pretty busy at the moment. Can you wait?

First Part: Did you like my performance? Second Part: No/No, I didn't.

The study focuses on the adjacency pairs in informal exchanges based on the two comedies “Ted” and “Ted 2” with the protagonists talking to each other – more specifically: the analysis is based on a scripted piece of spoken communication as

reflected in the comedy movie. The choice of the corpus and the reason for the analysis of a comedy film has to do with the genre as the author intends to investigate the characteristic features of the dispreferred second pair parts as well as the role and function they have in the given material. The study concentrates on *dispreferred second parts* or *dispreferred seconds (dispreferreds)*. It will be demonstrated that the second pair parts regarded as dispreferred do not necessarily have to evoke negative emotions, feelings or attitudes. What is more, even more importantly, it will be shown that the dispreferred second pair parts will bring forth a humorous effect. As a result, it will be stressed and demonstrated that the second pair parts regarded as the dispreferred should not always be viewed as negative. More specifically, we will attempt to show that the dispreferred second parts in the analyzed material will be presented in a humorous way and thus will be perceived more positively rather than negatively.

The paper is structured as follows: In section 2 there is an elaboration on the general notion and also key characteristics of adjacency pairs. Section 3 introduces the methodology of the study and section 4 the data analysis, discussion and observations, which lead to conclusions.

2. Adjacency pairs - theoretical background

2.1. The notion of an adjacency pair

Adjacency pairs constitute a conversational sequence of two related and mutually dependent utterances produced by two (or more) interlocutors. “The utterance of a first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pair” (Yule, 1996, p. 77). An *adjacency pair* as a sequence of two related utterances by two different speakers where the second utterance is always a response to the first – a first speaker makes an utterance and a second makes a response to the utterance. An *adjacency pair* always consists of two parts and there are two successive speakers involved (Yule, 1996, p. 77). It stands for the automatic sequences in the structure of conversation.

First Part: How are you?

Second Part: Fine, thank you.

First Part: How are you?

Second Part: Fine, how are you?

According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), there are certain features typical of adjacency pairs. They are adjacent as they follow each other directly – both a first and a second pair part; they are produced by different speakers, they have a particular order and they have a certain type. Hence, an *adjacency pair* is characterized by the following features:

1. Two utterance length
2. Adjacent positioning of the component utterances

3. Different speakers producing each utterance
4. Relative ordering of parts i.e. first pair parts precede second pair parts
5. Discriminative relations i.e. the pair type of which a first pair part is a member which is relevant to the selection among second pair parts

2.2. Preference organization

According to (Mazeland, 2006, p. 158-159), conversational interactions which occur naturally are much more preferred. The first pair part forces us to make some predictions and expectations about the content of the second pair part as “The utterance of a first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pair” (Yule, 1996, p. 77). If the utterance in the second part is compatible with the original speaker’s expectations, it will be perceived as a preferred second pair part (Pluszczyk, 2019, p. 162).

Other things in conversation can be done that set up expectations of specific sorts of response. When complaining to someone about their behaviour, for example, it is usual to expect that the person will produce an apology, a justification, an excuse or some combination of these expected responses. Where doing one thing with an utterance in talk sets up the expectation of a particular sort of thing being done in response, or at least where it makes the doing of the thing highly relevant, we can speak of paired utterances or adjacency pairs (Langford, 1994, p. 21).

On the other hand, there are a number of contextual settings where the second pair part is not always compatible with what we assume, expect or predict. There can also be other responses, as in: invitation – rejection, request – rejection, offer/suggestion - rejection. (Pluszczyk, 2019, p. 162).

First Part: Would you please fix me a drink?

Second Part: Do it yourself – I’m quite busy at the moment.

Or:

First Part: Do you fancy dancing with me?

Second Part: No.

Thus, we distinguish the occurrence of both *preferred* and *dispreferred turns*. *Preferred seconds* occur in a more natural way – they are usually characterized by natural production, immediate responses, without delay or hesitation. Moreover, they seem to be simple in comparison with *dispreferred second parts* or *dispreferred seconds*, which are more complex, more elaborate with the following features:

- delays due to pauses
- the use of prefaces (such markers as “well”, “uh”, etc.)
- accounts (explanations for why the dispreferred act is done)
- declination component

(Levinson 1983, p. 334; Cook, 1989, p. 54).

Similarly, Yule (1996, p. 81) highlights various means which might occur in a dispreferred second pair part. Similarly, the list pertains to how to do a dispreferred second pair part or dispreferred second. These are the following features with the examples (Yule, 1996, p. 81):

How to do a dispreferred response:

- a. delay / hesitate
- b. preface
- c. express doubt
- d. token Yes
- e. apology
- f. mention obligation
- g. appeal for understanding
- h. make it non-personal
- i. give an account
- j. use mitigators
- k. hedge the negative

Examples:

pause; er; em; ah
well; oh
I'm not sure; I don't know
that's great; I'd love to
I'm sorry; what a pity
I must do X; I'm expected in Y
you see; you know
everybody else; out there
too much work; no time left
really; mostly; sort of; kinda
I guess not; not possible

Yule (1996, p. 82) concludes that "...the overwhelming effect of a dispreferred is that more time and more language are used than in a preferred". As a result, the difference between preferred and dispreferred seconds would appear to be that preferred seconds occur predictably and naturally whereas dispreferred seconds are definitely unpredictable, unexpected, sudden and abrupt (Pluszczyk, 2019, p. 163). Consequently, "This is a general pattern: in contrast to the simple and immediate nature of preferreds, dispreferreds are delayed and contain additional complex components; and certain kinds of seconds like request rejections, refusals to offers, disagreements after evaluative assessments, etc., are systematically marked as dispreferreds" (Levinson, 1983, p. 308). Thus, dispreferred seconds are definitely more complex by nature. The complexity of dispreferreds is based on the language itself, the amount of the elements used (there would probably be more elements and the utterance would be longer) and the time needed for the response (it would probably be prolonged), such as delays, prefaces, hesitations, accounts, apologies, which undoubtedly accompany us when giving dispreferred second parts, etc. It must also be added that there are other factors which determine the structure of a dispreferred second, such as social distance between the interlocutors: the more social distance between the participants, the more elaborate the dispreferred seconds. Hence, the time spent talking – the duration and length of the talking time in the turn might differ as "The amount of talk employed to accomplish a particular social action in conversation is a pragmatic indicator of the relative distance between the participants" (Yule, 1996, p. 82).

According to Levinson (1983, p. 333), preferred seconds are unmarked whereas dispreferred seconds are marked as they are structurally more complex, taking into account all the aforementioned features by which they are characterized. Hence, Levinson stresses:

The parallel is therefore quite apt, because in a similar way preferred (and thus unmarked) seconds to different and unrelated adjacency pair first parts have less material than dispreferreds (marked seconds), but beyond that have little in common ... In contrast, dispreferred seconds of quite different and unrelated first parts (e.g. questions, offers, requests, summonses, etc.) have much in common, notably components of delay and parallel kinds of complexity. (Levinson, 1983, p. 333)

3. Methodology of the study

3.1. The scope and the objectives of the study

The study in the paper aims at analyzing the occurrence of adjacency pairs based on dispreferred pair parts. It analyzes the adjacency pairs where the second pair part is unexpected, harsh, spontaneous and abrupt and, as a result, the response provided by the second interlocutor would normally be considered to be dispreferred. Thus, the purpose of the study is to investigate the concept of *dispreferred seconds* (*dispreferred pair parts*) in selected mini exchanges taken from the two comedy films “Ted” and “Ted 2”. There are a number of examples of such exchanges in both films which reflect the second pair parts which could be labelled as dispreferred. However, many of them reflect instances where the second pair parts might be interpreted differently, or labelling them as dispreferred might be questionable. The objective of the study in this article is the analysis of exchanges where the second pair parts are undoubtedly dispreferred. Hence, the number of the examples analyzed is limited to 12. As a result, there are 12 randomly selected contexts which are characterized by the occurrence of adjacency pairs where the second part would be regarded as dispreferred as opposed to what we might expect. In other words, the dispreferred seconds or at least the seconds which would rather be labelled dispreferred, but which bring forth a humorous effect at the same time, according to the criterion suggested above, constitute the objective of the study. The number of the instances seems to be insufficient, but it must be added that these are suggested as the best and the clearest examples of the exchanges where the potentially negative second pair parts might be regarded as positive.

As a result, the objectives of the study are as follows:

- to identify and analyze the features of dispreferred second turns (dispreferreds) presented in the analysis based on the comedy films “Ted” and “Ted 2”;
- to identify and analyze the role or function of dispreferred adjacency pairs presented in the analysis based on the comedy films “Ted” and “Ted 2”;

The objectives of the article aim at answering the following research questions:

- 1) What *features* do the second turns deemed to be dispreferred have in the given material? Do the dispreferred second parts always contain the features which are ascribed to them in the conversational interactions as suggested in the CA?

2) How are the dispreferred second turns interpreted? How do they *function* in conversational interactions? What role do they play in the given material? Are the dispreferred second turns always perceived negatively in the presented exchanges?

3.2. Research methods and procedure

Conversational Analysis constitutes a methodological approach which deals with the study of talk produced in social interaction performed by the interlocutors. Adjacency pairs, which are analyzed through conversation analysis will constitute the primary object in the presentation of the analysis. This research will use a qualitative descriptive method. By using this research type, the author will identify the adjacency pairs between the protagonists in the film. With a view to selecting only the instances where the second pair parts are undoubtedly dispreferred, there are 12 instances of conversational exchanges in which the author identified the dispreferred second pair parts/ dispreferred seconds with a view to discussing their features and function. All the sequential utterances produced by the protagonists in each conversational exchange will be described, analyzed and discussed qualitatively. It must be stressed that based on the analyzed material, these are the best examples of the exchanges where the potentially dispreferred second pair parts (dispreferreds) might be perceived as positive rather than negative due to a humorous effect which they cause in the given exchanges.

3.3. Limitations

Undeniably, there are some limitations within the study design and scope. Firstly, there are only twelve exchanges based on the presented material. Taking into account the objectives and thus the qualitative method (not quantitative) used in the study, the limited number of the analyzed examples is justified. In other words, in order to analyze the material quantitatively, the number of the analyzed instances would have to be much higher with a view to obtaining reliable results. Due to the obvious space constraints and the objective of the study, the analysis is qualitative.

Secondly, the data analyzed in this study is limited to one type of register: it only pertains to selected protagonists in a particular setting and one type of discourse – film discourse and also one type of film genre - a comedy, which is the object of the study. It would be interesting to broaden the scope of research by encompassing more genres of film discourse (including an absurd comedy) with a view to analyzing the occurrence of dispreferred second parts and their function in a greater variety of contextual settings.

Thirdly, the material which served as a basis for the analysis is undoubtedly “artificial” as opposed to natural or spontaneous since the language in the analysis

of the conversation is based on film discourse – language which is scripted. Thus, the question arises why material based on the movie is analyzed rather than the material based on natural conversational exchanges. In fact, the results of this study might serve as a good reference point and a basis for comparison to other studies. Admittedly, there are not many research studies on the occurrence of the dispreferred pair parts based on film discourse – especially comedy films. Thus, it is necessary to look at the phenomenon from another perspective – from the perspective of the less natural spoken film discourse. Moreover, doing research studies based on film discourse in this respect would serve as a reference point with a view to comparing the characteristic features of the dispreferreds and their function. Undeniably, it would be more reliable and more interesting to analyze the occurrence of adjacency pairs in more spontaneous conversational exchanges or communicative settings - looking into the occurrence of adjacency pairs which occur spontaneously and verify the occurrence of the features ascribed to dispreferred second turns.

4. Data analysis, discussion and observations

The study aims at analyzing the occurrence of the dispreferred second parts based on a comedy film. Hence, with reference to the objectives of the study, each example below portrays a typical conversational exchange where, as will be argued, the second pair part is definitely dispreferred. It is necessary to clarify what is meant by a dispreferred second part and in what circumstances it is analyzed. The dispreferred second part, which is allegedly supposed to be negative, is analyzed with reference to the first part.

Let us have a closer look at some of the examples:

1) MOVIE: “TED” [05:13 – 05:36]
CHILD: Mom, Dad. Guess what. My teddy bear’s alive!
FATHER: [chuckles]
MOTHER: Really? Well, isn’t that exciting?
CHILD: No, Mom. He’s really alive. Look!
TEDDY BEAR: Merry Christmas, everybody!
PARENTS: [scream]
FATHER: Jesus H. Fuck!
TEDDY BEAR: Let’s all be best friends.
MOTHER: Oh my God!
FATHER: John, get away from that thing. Get over here, right now.
CHILD: But, Dad.
FATHER: Get over here!
MOTHER: Listen to your father! Come here!
FATHER: Helen, get my gun.
CHILD: Dad, no!

In the exchange above, we observe the parents' astonishment when they come to the realization that the teddy bear is really alive and that it is not just a toy. The teddy bear's utterance *Merry Christmas, everybody!*, which constitutes the first pair part apparently evoked a very negative response *Jesus H. Fuck!* instead of a more positive and expected response, such as a reciprocation in kind. The dispreferred second is definitely unpredictable and impolite in the context of wishing someone *Merry Christmas*. Similarly, the teddy bear's suggestion *Let's all be best friends* and the father's response *John, get away from that thing. Get over here, right now* is incongruous to our expectations and as a result we obtain another negative response, which constitutes a dispreferred second. Finally, the father's request *Helen, get my gun*, which constitutes another dispreferred second does not favour successful communication, but causes laughter as the idea of trying to shoot the teddy bear, which is the child's gift, is definitely ridiculous.

2) MOVIE: "TED" [0:15:33 – 0:16:28]

JOHN: *So bad, but so good.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Hey, by the way, don't let me forget. You and I gotta nail down a plan for the Bruins game tomorrow night.*

JOHN: *No, I can't. I'm taking Lori to dinner.*

TEDDY BEAR: *For what?*

JOHN: *Well, we've been dating four years tomorrow.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Oh, fuck me. Nice.*

JOHN: *You know, let me ask you something. I mean, she's gonna be expecting something big, do you ... ?*

TEDDY BEAR: *What, like anal?*

JOHN: *No, like a fucking circular gold thing on the finger.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Oh, fuck that. It's been four years, Johnny. You and me have been together for 27 years. Where's my ring, huh? Where's my ring, asshole?*

JOHN: *Would you stop it?*

TEDDY BEAR: *Where's my ring, motherfucker? Come on. Put it on my fuzzy finger, you fuck. Come on!*

JOHN: *All right, all right. Knock it off. All right. I'm just saying. But do you think she might be expecting me to make that kind of a move?*

TEDDY BEAR: *No, no. I don't think she is. And not only that, it's the wrong time. It's a terrible idea. I mean, you got the economy, you got the credit bubble, the Supreme Court. I mean, look at Haiti.*

JOHN: *Yes, I guess I didn't think about that.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Well, that's ... You know, it's a fact.*

This is a conversation between the two main protagonists – the teddy bear and John. John has been dating his girlfriend Lori for quite a long time and asks his friend for some advice as to the next steps of his plans towards his girlfriend. Hence the question posed by John *You know, let me ask you something. I mean, she's gonna be expecting something big, do you ... ?* The response *What, like anal?* made by the teddy bear is definitely unexpected and abrupt. It constitutes a dispreferred second

due to the vulgarity and directness on the part of the teddy bear. John's statement *No, like a fucking circular gold thing on the finger* makes it clear that he is thinking of getting engaged with his girlfriend. However, the teddy bear's response *Oh, fuck that. It's been four years, Johnny. You and me have been together for 27 years. Where's my ring, huh? Where's my ring, asshole?*, which constitutes a dispreferred second, is definitely unexpected and thus incongruous to John's utterance, which is a first pair part. There is no doubt that the response evokes laughter, taking into account the teddy bear's jealousy and the language. Undeniably, he does not want John to get engaged with his girlfriend since he does not want to lose his friend. The teddy bear's expectations are different and he demands that John focus on him rather than on his girlfriend – which is reflected in these utterances *Where's my ring, huh? Where's my ring, asshole? Where's my ring, motherfucker? Come on. Put it on my fuzzy finger, you fuck. Come on!* The use of swearwords and offensive language increases the force of the utterances, which definitely constitute dispreferred seconds.

3) MOVIE: "TED" [0:27:10 – 0:27:30]

LORI: *What is that?*

TEDDY BEAR: *What is what?*

LORI: *There is a shit on my floor. In the corner, there is a shit!*

TEDDY BEAR: *Oh, yeah. Yeah. We were playing Truth or Dare, and Cherene's pretty balsy.*

LORI: *There is a shit on my floor!*

TEDDY BEAR: *Well, or is the floor on the shit, is what Kierkegaard would say.*

Lori has just come back home, enters the living room and sees some people sitting on the couch. This does not make her happy at all – she is really annoyed. To make things worse, there is a lot of mess in the room. Lori's utterance, which constitutes a first pair part *There is a shit on my floor. In the corner, there is a shit!* is an exclamation which requires a certain response. The response *Oh, yeah. Yeah. We were playing Truth or Dare, and Cherene's pretty balsy* made by teddy bear is against our expectations as normally we would expect the teddy bear to provide an explanation in order to appease Lori. To make things worse, on hearing the same utterance *There is a shit on my floor!*, the teddy bear responds in an unpredictable and unexpected way: *Well, or is the floor on the shit, is what Kierkegaard would say*, which probably increased Lori's annoyance. Undeniably, the teddy bear's irrelevant and unexpected response, which definitely constitutes a dispreferred second pair part also contributes to the formation of a humorous effect.

4) MOVIE: "TED" [0:29:56 – 0:30:50]

EMPLOYER: *So you think you got what it takes?*

TEDDY BEAR: *I'll tell you what I got ... your wife's pussy on my breath.*

EMPLOYER: *Nobody's ever talked to me like that before.*

TEDDY BEAR: *That's 'cause everyone's mouth is usually full of your wife's box.*

EMPLOYER: *You're hired.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Shit.*

In this conversational exchange, the teddy bear, who is looking for a job at the supermarket, talks to his prospective employer. The truth is that he does not really want to get this job, but promised John that he would do his best. As a result, although he attends the interview, he does everything in order not to get the job and even going so far as to use offensive language and discourage the employer from giving him the job. Hence, the employer's question *So you think you got what it takes?* and the teddy bear's response *I'll tell you what I got ... your wife's pussy on my breath*, which constitutes a dispreferred second. To make it even worse, the employer's utterance, which constitutes a first pair part *Nobody's ever talked to me like that before* provokes another response on the part of the teddy bear, which is another dispreferred second as it is equally rude and offensive - *That's 'cause everyone's mouth is usually full of your wife's box*. Finally, the employer's utterance *You're hired* would normally evoke happiness and joy. Apparently, the fact of being hired did not make the teddy bear happy due to his response *shit*. Thus, this unpredictable response *shit*, which constitutes another dispreferred second to *You're hired* causes laughter.

5) MOVIE: "TED" [0:41:36 – 0:41:55]

TEDDY BEAR'S BOSS: You had sexual intercourse with a co-worker ... on top of the produce that we sell to the public.

TEDDY BEAR: I fucked her with a parsnip last week, and I sold the parsnip to a family with four small children.

TEDDY BEAR'S BOSS: That took guts. We need guts. I'm promoting you.

TEDDY BEAR: You got a lot of problems, don't you?

In this conversational exchange the teddy bear and his boss are having a serious conversation. The teddy bear's response to his boss's accusation of making love to a co-worker is definitely against our expectations and thus dispreferred. Normally, we would expect the teddy bear to defend himself, explain his behaviour and apologize whereas the teddy bear makes the situation even more difficult by mentioning all the details related to his "entertainment", such as "I fucked her with a parsnip last week, and I sold the parsnip to a family with four small children". In fact, one might get the impression that the teddy bear does everything to be fired. However, it turns out that the teddy bear's unacceptable behaviour is not only accepted by his boss – it is also praised by him.

6) MOVIE: "TED" [0:44:50 – 0:45:17]

LORI: So, Tami-Lynn ... Why don't you tell us a little bit about yourself? Like, where are you from? I'm always fascinated to meet Ted's girlfriends.

TAMI-LYNN: What do you mean, girlfriends? Was there, like, a lot of them or something?

TEDDY BEAR: No, no. That's not what she meant at all.

TAMI-LYNN: Right, Lori? Lori, you didn't mean that?

LORI: No no, what I meant to say was Ted's very handsome, so I'm always interested in meeting the lady that can snatch him up.

TAMI-LYNN: *Did you just call me a whore?*

LORI: *What?*

TAMI-LYNN: *You just worry about your own snatch. How about that, honey?*

In this exchange, one can observe a heated conversation between Lori and Tami-Lynn who is apparently over-sensitive. The truth is that Lori has no bad intentions when talking to her interlocutor – Tami-Lynn. She does not want to argue – she wants to get to know Tami-Lynn better and probably have a nice and friendly conversation. However, Tami-Lynn does not get the point and as a result, the conversation ends in failure. Lori's utterance *I'm always fascinated to meet Ted's girlfriends* makes Tami-Lynn distrustful and suspicious and hence the response in the form of a question *What do you mean, girlfriends? Was there, like, a lot of them or something?* Similarly, Lori's utterance *No no, what I meant to say was Ted's very handsome, so I'm always interested in meeting the lady that can snatch him up*, which constitutes a first pair part turns out to be provocative and as a result Tami-Lynn perceives it as an insult or an offence. Hence the question, which constitutes a dispreferred second pair part *Did you just call me a whore?* Even though it is dispreferred, it brings forth a humorous effect.

7) MOVIE: "TED" [1:15:44 – 1:15:48]

CHILD'S FATHER: *Hi, Ted.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Fuck.*

This is an example of a short conversational exchange where the child's father greets his interlocutor saying *Hi, Ted*. The response *Fuck* is definitely against our expectations – it is undeniably a dispreferred second which evokes negative feelings. Normally, one would expect to receive a response, such as "Hi" or "Hello", which would definitely be a preferred second. Generally, the response in this exchange would definitely be incongruous with our expectations although in this contextual setting the utterance with the word *fuck* made by our protagonist is justified due to the feelings he has towards his interlocutor – the child's father (as we know the child's father wants to catch the teddy bear and hurt him).

8) MOVIE: "TED 2" [0:28:34 – 0:29:37]

DOCTOR: *I'm afraid I have bad news. I won't be able to perform the implantation procedure.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Wait, what?*

TAMY-LYNN: *Why not?*

DOCTOR: *Tamy-Lynn, according to your test results, you're no longer fertile.*

TAMY-LYNN: *What?*

TEDDY BEAR: *Wait, Doc, are you sure about that? Maybe you should check again or something, you know?*

DOCTOR: *I'm quite sure. Tamy-Lynn, because of your history of excessive drug use ... your ovarian canal has been somewhat compromised.*

TEDDY BEAR: *What are you talking about? It looks fine.*

TAMY-LYNN: *Yeah.*

DOCTOR: *Forgive me. That's a normal ovary. This is Tamy-Lynn's.*

TEDDY BEAR: *Jesus.*

TAMY-LYNN: *Yeah, but I bet this stuff happens a lot. You probably see this kind of stuff all the time, right?*

DOCTOR: *No, not once. Not ever. When I saw this, I threw up. Almost quit medicine. The bottom line is, insemination is not possible.*

TAMY-LYNN: *[sobbing] I don't understand, okay? It doesn't make any sense.*

TEDDY BEAR: *It's okay. It's okay, honey. Come one. Let's go.*

TAMY-LYNN: *But what does this mean, Teddy? Does it mean we can't have a baby?*

TEDDY BEAR: *I don't know, but it's gonna be okay. Everything's gonna be okay.*

DOCTOR: *It isn't.*

This is a serious conversation with the doctor. There are two utterances which need to be commented on – Tami-Lynn's utterance *Yeah, but I bet this stuff happens a lot. You probably see this kind of stuff all the time, right?* and the doctor's response *No, not once. Not ever. When I saw this, I threw up. Almost quit medicine. The bottom line is, insemination is not possible.* The doctor's utterance, which is a response to Tamy-Lynn's question, definitely constitutes a dispreferred second pair part. It is not a normal situation for the doctor to use such harsh and vulgar words when talking to a patient. The utterance *When I saw this, I threw up. Almost quit medicine* evokes very negative feelings and is definitely repulsive, especially that the utterance is made by the doctor. Nevertheless, in this contextual setting, the utterance is incongruous to the question and thus brings forth a humorous effect.

9) MOVIE: "TED 2" [0:35:35 – 0:35:45]

JOHN: *Uh, are those hard candies, like, just to take?*

LAWYER: *Uh, those aren't supposed to be out.*

In this dialogue the main protagonist, John, is talking to the lawyer. It is obviously a strange situation if someone wants to treat themselves and the response on the part of the host is negative. In fact, the lawyer's response *Uh, those aren't supposed to be out*, which constitutes a dispreferred second is a refusal to John's request *Uh, are those hard candies, like, just to take?* This fact makes the situation abnormal, ridiculous and funny at the same time.

10) MOVIE: "TED 2" [0:52:15 – 0:52:48]

LAWYER: *Ms. McCafferty, you and Ted recently considered adopting a child. Is that correct?*

TAMI-LYNN: *Yeah.*

LAWYER: *If I may inquire, why did you not choose to have a child of your own?*

TAMI-LYNN: *'Cause Teddy ain't got no dick.*

LAWYER: *And why does Teddy not possess a, uh, male appendage? Is it a freak of genetics?*

TAMI-LYNN: *No, asshole. He ain't got a dick 'cause he's a fucking toy! What's your excuse?*

TEDDY BEAR: *Oh! Take a burn!*

JOHN: *Yeah! How's your tongue taste in your own ass, Poindexter?*

TEDDY BEAR: *Yeah! How'd you ... What?*

The situation takes place in a courtroom. The lawyer's question *If I may inquire, why did you not choose to have a child of your own?* constitutes a first pair part and Tami-Lynn's response *'Cause Teddy ain't got no dick* is a second pair part, which undeniably brings forth a humorous effect. It is obvious that the word *dick* is inappropriate, especially in such a contextual setting. Similarly, the next response which Tami-Lynn makes is rude and contains taboo language, such as *asshole, dick* and *fucking*: *No, asshole. He ain't got a dick 'cause he's a fucking toy! What's your excuse?* Taking into account the choice of words, the register and style, there is no doubt that the language is inappropriate for such a situation. Hence, due to this incongruity we obtain a humorous effect.

11) MOVIE: "TED 2" [0:53:19 – 0:53:58]

LAWYER: *Mr. Bennett, when and where did you first encounter Ted?*

JOHN: *What do you mean? My parents got him for me when I was a kid.*

LAWYER: *Aha. They "got him". Where did they get him?*

JOHN: *Child World toy store.*

LAWYER: *I'm sorry? I couldn't hear. Could you repeat that?*

JOHN: *Child World toy store. You fucking heard me.*

LAWYER: *There's no need for hostility, Mr. Bennett.*

JOHN: *Why? Nobody here likes you! I saw you eating lunch alone! You're a loser!*

LAWYER: *Your Honor?*

JUDGE: *Mr. Bennett?*

JOHN: *I hope your kids get bird flu.*

JUDGE: *Mr. Bennett!*

JOHN: *I'm sorry.*

LAWYER: *Now, you said your parents purchased Ted as one might purchase a baseball glove or a big wheel.*

JOHN: *No, it's not like that!*

This conversation is also held in a courtroom. There are a few conversational exchanges between John and the lawyer. John is annoyed and reluctant to answer the lawyer's uncomfortable questions. Thus, the response which John makes reflects his annoyance and frustration - *Child World toy store. You fucking heard me.* Admittedly, the use of a swearword *fucking* is inappropriate in this context taking into consideration the circumstances and the seriousness of the situation. It is unimaginable to use such words as a witness when responding to the lawyer's questions in the presence of the audience, the judge, etc. in a courtroom. The next utterance made by John *Why? Nobody here likes you! I saw you eating lunch alone! You're a loser!* is definitely incongruous to what we might expect to hear in a courtroom. The utterance is irrelevant to the situation presented, which contributes to the funniness. Finally, the utterance *I hope your kids get bird flu* made by the protagonist is funny in the sense that it is definitely unsuitable in these circumstances.

12) MOVIE: "TED 2" [1:31:48 – 1:32:04]

SAM: *Hey, Bennett!*

JOHN: *Oh, shit.*

SAM: *You messed up my car. What the hell is wrong with you?*

JOHN: *Look, Sam, this is a really bad time, all right? Something happened to Ted.*

SAM: *But it was a good time for you to vandalize my Chrysler though.*

JOHN: *Hey, fuck your Chrysler!*

In this example, John's response *Hey, fuck your Chrysler!* is definitely a dispreferred second as John is definitely not concerned about his interlocutor's car. Moreover, the use of a swear word *fuck* increases the force of the utterance. Admittedly, it contradicts our expectations as we find out that John does not care about the car and the owner at all. However, the response made by John *Hey, fuck your Chrysler!* makes Sam even more annoyed. However, John's response might be perceived as humorous at the same time.

5. Conclusions

The objective of the study was to identify examples of dispreferred seconds and analyze them from a positive perspective. More specifically, the objectives were to identify the characteristic features of the dispreferred seconds and also identify the role or function of the presented dispreferred seconds. As far as the former is concerned, features reserved for the dispreferred second parts were taken into account, such as such as delays, prefaces, expressing doubt, hesitations, accounts - explanations, apologies, appealing for understanding, using mitigators (Yule, 1996, p. 81). The role or function refers to the final effect which is achieved via the aforementioned dispreferred seconds. This was the second objective of the analysis – to analyze what role the dispreferreds have in the given material. The method used in the study was qualitative and each example was analyzed descriptively.

The results of this study reveal that the dispreferred second parts presented in the study are not characterized by the incidence of the aforementioned features which are described and discussed in the literature, such as: delays, prefaces, doubt, accounts, hesitation, apology, appeal for understanding, mitigators and others. In the given examples, there were no features which are typical of dispreferred second parts. In fact, the utterances in the presented dispreferred second parts were natural and automatic. Moreover, with reference to the aforementioned features, it is impossible to discuss the complexity of dispreferred seconds as opposed to preferred ones. The dispreferred seconds presented in the material occurred spontaneously and naturally without any additional features. As a result, based on the observations in this study, it can be observed that the borderline between the preferred and dispreferred second parts is not so clear-cut in this respect. At least the difference is not so evident in film discourse as opposed to spontaneous exchanges in real-life, natural circumstances based on spontaneous exchanges. However, the lack of the typical features ascribed to the dispreferred second parts

in the given material does not necessarily have to do with the film discourse as such, but the choice of the film genre, which is a comedy film. In other words, on one hand, the same features which were not identified in the given material might be encountered in other film genres, indeed the responses which reflect the dispreferred second parts evoke laughter and thus are positive rather than negative. On the other hand, there are some other research studies on film discourse, such as comedies (romantic comedies) which confirm the occurrence of the features which are typical of dispreferred second parts denial, refusal, making an account, mentioning obligations etc. (Krisna Murti, 2014, p. 77).

As far as the role or function of the dispreferred second parts is concerned, based on the examples portrayed in the analysis, one can easily observe that the use of the dispreferred second parts is undoubtedly positive, but it brings forth a humorous effect. As a result, the utterances which are in the dispreferred seconds are unexpected, astonishing and therefore humorous. In fact, all the examples of the dispreferred seconds which were chosen to analyze portray a humorous effect.

References

- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krisna Murti, I. (2014). A sociolinguistic analysis of dispreferred act on the second pair part by the main character in the movie *Beauty and the Briefcase*. Unpublished thesis. Yogyakarta University. (<https://eprints.uny.ac.id/17617/1/Irma%20Krisna%20Murti%2010211144028.pdf>).
- Langford, D. (1994). *Analyzing talk. Investigating verbal interaction in English*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malmkjaer, K. (2006). *Linguistics and the language of translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mazeland, H. (2006). *Conversation analysis. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. 2nd Edition. Oxford, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, Vol. 3, pp. 153-162. (<http://www.let.rug.nl/mazeland/ELL06maz.pdf>, last accessed: 20.08.2023).
- Nordquist, R. (2017). *Adjacency pairs*. (<https://www.thoughtco.com/adjacency-pair-conversation-analysis-1688970>).
- Pluszczyk, A. (2019). A study of adjacency pairs in film discourse: The case of dispreferred second parts. In Krawczyk, E. (Ed.). *Continuity and change. Conflict or Agreement?* (pp. 20-40). Katowice: Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania Ochroną Pracy w Katowicach.
- Richards, J. C. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Schegloff, E. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. In *American Anthropologist* 70, 1075–1095.
- Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. In *Semiotica* 8 (4), 289–327.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.