

THE ANALYSIS OF DISAGREEMENT ACT IN *THE FAULT IN OUR STARS* MOVIE

Beny Setiawan¹, Zulia Chasanah²

Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo, Jln. K.H.A. Dahlan Purworejo 54111, Indonesia

Corresponding e-mail: setiawanbeny15@gmail.com

Abstract

This is a qualitative research. The aims of this study are to find out the types of disagreement act and to identify the way certain types of disagreement act are expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. In collecting the data, the writers uses some steps: finding the movie, watching the movie and finding the disagreement act in the movie. In analyzing the data, the writers also used some steps: listing the data which is found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie, and classifying the disagreement act based on their type. The results of this research are as follows. First, there are two types of disagreement acts found in the movie. They are 61 mitigated disagreement act and 12 unmitigated disagreement act. Second, the researcher can reveal the way certain types of disagreement act are expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. The occurrence of mitigated disagreement acts is realized in 9 ways. They are (1) 9 use of hedges, (2) 5 use of modal verbs, (3) 1 question objection, (4) 18 objective explanations, (5) 5 personal emotions, (6) 4 changing topics, (7) 3 shifting responsibilities, (8) 11 in-group identity markers, and (9) 5 token agreements. Meanwhile, the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement acts is realized in 3 ways. Those realizations are (1) 9 short directs of opposite orientation, (2) 2 sarcastic remarks, and (3) 1 short rude question.

Keywords: *Disagreement Act, Fault in Our Stars, movie*

INTRODUCTION

Language is the most important aspect in human life to communicate to each other. Many people use language in everyday's life either spoken or written because it is ways or rules of people's to express their minds, feelings, ideas, and emotions. It is used when there are two persons or more in a certain situation. For instance, it is almost impossible for a seller to interact with his buyer without talking to one another as the seller needs a brief explanation of product to the buyer before pay that product. They must have conversation so that their messages could be delivered to one another.

Conversation always has an structural pattern. It means that when a person says an utterance which is considered as the first part, the addressee will say the next act as the second part which is expected or unexpected by the first person. It is called preferred response while the later is called dispreferred response. The preferred responses are in the form of agreement and acceptance, while the

dispreferred responses are in the form of disagreement, refusal, and declination. Yule (1996: 82) in his book *Pragmatics* states that the expression of a dispreferred response represents distance and lack of connection. It happens when the second person does not give an expected answer to what is being expected by the first person. It could arouse problems if the dispreferred response is not delivered properly by the second person. This phenomenon inevitably happens in daily life.

One of the forms of dispreferred responses is disagreement act. Sifianou (2012: 1554) states that disagreement can be defined as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker. When two or more people communicate and express their opinions, it is inevitable that they may have different opinions and say their disagreement. For example, a girl asks a boy to a movie tomorrow. Actually, the boy does not like the girl but he does not want to hurt the girl's feeling. He tries not to say a direct answer as a 'no' to the girl but he gives explanations and reasons why he is not available tomorrow instead. In fact, what the boy has stated is one of the forms of disagreements as disagreement acts could be delivered through several different ways. This kind of act then could make a difficult and unpleasant situation even might risk threat.

Part of the conversation can be as natural as people's daily interaction but it can also be arranged first. For instance, there are a director and a script writer who manage all the dialogue of the characters in a movie. Indeed, it is not a natural conversation as the participants of the conversation have known what would be responded by others. It is different from natural conversation in which people who are in the midst of conversation do not know what others will respond to their question or argument. They could only expect and guess.

However, movies represent the daily life condition. What happen in a movie could also happen in daily life so that it can be mirror to the real world phenomena. The differences would be on the way those conversations happen. In daily life, people do not arrange what they will utter. It would be according to the topic they are discussing. Meanwhile, in a movie, the conversation would be arranged and planned first by the director. However, the fact is that every situation and the way people communicate would be the same. They exchange ideas to communicate through language.

The choice of a movie script as the subject of the study is made up upon the consideration that the dialogue is within limited time and that it contains preference structure to be analyzed. The dialogue that is being analyzed is from a movie entitled

The Fault in Our Stars which is adopted from a novel of the same title by John Green. It was directed by Josh Boone and released on June 6, 2014 in the United States. It receives several awards and nominations afterward. The main

plot of the movie starts when Hazel Grace Lancaster (Shailene Woodley), a teenager who is diagnosed having thyroid cancer, meets Augustus Waters (Ansel Elgort), a teenager who has lost one of his legs from bone cancer, in a cancer patients' support group. They travel to Amsterdam together with all of their weaknesses. During the trip, the relationship between Hazel and Augustus grows from friendship to love.

The writers chose *The Fault in Our Stars* as the subject of analysis because it has some problems containing disagreement expressions. They are reflected in a movie like in a real setting of natural daily conversation. Despite its high rating, the movie also gives values for people of all ages; it attracts people's sympathy toward a love line between two sick young fellows who are enthusiastically doing what they think they have to do before dying. Well, it is very interesting to be discussed.

Therefore, the writers conducted a research entitled "*The Analysis of Disagreement Act In The Fault in Our Star movie.*" The writers analyzed disagreement act from this movie. It may be useful for many people and in language teaching.

Disagreement Act

Sifianou (2012: 1554), defines disagreement as the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker.

Types of Disagreement Act

Panic-Kavagic (2013: 449) states 2 types of disagreement acts:

a. Mitigated Disagreement Act

Mitigated verbal disagreements are disagreements whose potential face-threatening force has been softened or minimized. The occurrence of mitigated disagreement acts is realized in 9 ways. They are:

(1) the use of hedges

Well, they're not so much cold as just under-oxygenated

(2) the use of modal verbs

This is an opportunity that I may never get again.

(3) question objection

And I feel like ending your book in the middle of a sentence violates that contract, don't you think?

(4) objective explanation

It is a drawing of a pipe. See? A drawing of a thing is not the thing itself. Nor is a T-shirt of a drawing of a thing, the thing itself.

(5) personal emotion

And I don't love it.

(6) changing topic

Can you just get in the car, please?

(7) shifting responsibility

You know, you just die in the middle of life. You die in the middle of a sentence.

(8) in-group identity marker

I am not depressed, Mom.

(9) token agreement.

Okay, well, that's great. But I am not beautiful.

b. Unmitigated Disagreement Act

Unmitigated disagreements could be referred to strong disagreements. the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement acts is realized in 3 ways. Those realizations are:

(1) short direct of opposite orientation

I don't want to read anything.

(2) sarcastic remark

Could you just not be ridiculous right now, please?

(3) short rude question.

Frannie : Well, then you've got to stay healthy. Come on, just eat something, honey.

Hazel : "*Stay healthy*" ? Okay, I'm not healthy, and I'm gonna die.

METHOD

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach because it describes and analyzes the phenomena of the study in narrative descriptions. Qualitative research is an interpretative research since it identifies reflexively biases, values, and personal background that should be interpreted by the researcher (Creswell, 2009: 177). Thus, the focus of this research is to get a deeper understanding of disagreement acts based on certain contexts found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie.

The data of the research were in the form of utterances that were spoken by the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. The context of the research was the dialogs of the movie. Meanwhile, the main data source of this study was a movie script.

The primary instrument of this study is the writer herself who is involved in the whole process of data collection and data analysis. The secondary instruments are a data sheet and some writing equipment such as a notebook and a pen.

The writers did some steps to collect the data. They are watching the movie and observing the objective of the research, reviewing related literature, taking a note on the disagreement acts based on the script and the movie, collecting and classifying the data in the data sheet, and coding each datum in the data sheet.

Data analysis is conducted after the whole data are collected and it should determine the focus and strategies used in data collection (Vanderstoep and Johnston, 2009: 190-191). Thus, in analyzing the data, the writers conducted some steps in the following.

1. Categorizing the data into each type and realization of disagreement acts based on.
Locher's categorization in the data sheet.
2. Analyzing and describing the data.
3. Applying the trustworthiness of the data to reach its credibility.
4. Making conclusions and suggestions of the analysis based on the results.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

The findings of types, realizations, and reasons of disagreement acts are presented in the following table.

Table 4. **Types and Realizations of Disagreement Acts in *The Fault in Our Stars* Movie**

NO	TYPES AND REALIZATIONS		DATA	PERCENTAGE
1	MITIGATED DISAGREEMENT	The Use of Hedges	9	12.16%
		The Use of Modal Verbs	5	8.11%
		Question Objection	1	1.35%
		Objective Explanation	18	24.32%
		Personal Emotion	5	6.76%
		Changing Topic	4	5.41%
		Shifting Responsibility	3	4.05%
		In-group Identity Marker	11	14.86%
		Token Agreement	5	6.76%
		A Short Direct of Opposite Orientation	9	12.16%
2	UNMITIGATED DISAGREEMENT	Sarcastic Remark	2	2.70%
		A Short Rude Question	1	1.35%
		TOTAL	74	100%

2. Discussions

Based on the table, there are two types of disagreement act strategies found in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie; they are mitigated disagreement act and unmitigated disagreement act. Each type of strategy is performed in the form of different realizations. The mitigated disagreement acts are realized by (1) the use of hedges

Hazel : So how are your eyes, Isaac?

Isaac : They're good. They're not in my head is the only problem. Besides that...

Augustus : Well, umm, it appears my entire body is made out of cancer now. So, sorry to one-up you, dude.

Augustus uses the expression 'well' as a preface to indicate a topic change. He does not want Isaac to feel sad only because he has lost his sight as he himself suffers a worse condition that his entire body is attacked by cancer which will make him dead soon.

(2) the use of modal verbs

Dr. Simmons : You're stage four.

Hazel : This is an opportunity that I may never get again. Ever. If the medication is working, I don't understand why...

In this expression, Hazel uses a modal auxiliary 'may' to state a possibility emphasizing that going to Amsterdam with Augustus and not with her own money is the only chance she gets in her entire life; there is a possibility that Hazel can die first before going to Amsterdam, a city that she wants to visit so much before dying to get the answer from Peter Van Houten about the ending of her favorite book.

(3) question objection

He ends his statement by questioning Hazel 'don't you think' to emphasize his disagreement. Although Augustus clearly states his disagreement, he expresses this by smiling and with no anger at all.

(4) objective explanation

(5) personal emotion, (6) changing topic, (7) shifting responsibility, (8) in-group identity marker, and (9) token agreement. However, not all realizations of disagreement acts which have presented in the literature review are found in this movie. The type which is not found is in the form of down-toning the effect of statement because the characters in the movie often deliver their disagreements in order to show that the current speaker's statement is wrong and its effect should not be down-toned. As presented in the table, the mitigated disagreement acts

which are performed often by the characters in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie is the realization of objective explanation in disagreement expression.

Meanwhile, the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement acts is realized in three ways. Those realizations are (1) a short direct of opposite orientation, (2) sarcastic remark, and (3) a short rude question. From the data above, a short direct of opposite orientation is considered as the main realization of unmitigated disagreement act because it often occurs in this movie.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data that have been collected and analyzed, the writers may draw conclusions as follows.

First, there are two types of disagreement acts found in the movie. They are 61 mitigated disagreement act and 12 unmitigated disagreement act. The second objective of the research is to identify the way certain types of disagreement acts are expressed in *The Fault in Our Stars* movie. The occurrence of mitigated disagreement acts is realized in 9 ways. They are (1) 9 use of hedges, (2) 5 use of modal verbs, (3) 1 question objection, (4) 18 objective explanations, (5) 5 personal emotions, (6) 4 changing topics, (7) 3 shifting responsibilities, (8) 11 in-group identity markers, and (9) 5 token agreements. Meanwhile, the occurrence of unmitigated disagreement acts is realized in 3 ways. Those realizations are (1) 9 short directs of opposite orientation, (2) 2 sarcastic remarks, and (3) 1 short rude question.

REFERENCES

- Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Third Ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Kreutel, K. 2007. "I'm not agree with you." ESL Learner's Expressions of Disagreement. *TESL-EJ* (Vol. 11), pp. 1-31.
- Locher, M.A. 2004. *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreement in Oral Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Panic-Kavgic, O. 2013. "Patterns of Dispreferred Verbal Disagreement in Dialogues from American and Serbian Films". *Languages and Cultures Across Time and Space*, pp. 445-459.
- Pomerantz, A. 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes". In: Atkinson, J.M. and Heritage, J. (Eds.),

Structures of Social Action, pp. 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sifianou, M. 2012. “Disagreements, Face, and Politeness”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, pp. 1554–1564.

Vanderstoep, S.W., and D. Johnston. 2009. *Research Method of Everyday Life*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

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