CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the theories and previous studies related to the problem of this study. The theories and previous studies are put in two different parts. The first part is theoretical framework, while the second part is previous studies.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The writer included Locher's (2004) on disagreement as the main theory in analyzing the data and supported by theory of social distance.

2.1.1 Disagreement strategies

According to Locher's theory (2004) "disagreement is likely to involve the exercise of power because it entails and therefore also a clash of interests". According to Waldron and Applegate (1994) cited in Locher's (2004) define verbal disagreement as a form of conflict. It is because verbal disagreements are taxing communication events which are characterized by incompatible goals, negotiation, and the need to coordinate self and other actions.

Locher (2004) divides eight categories of expressing disagreement, consisting of the use of hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, the use of modal auxiliaries, shifting responsibility, stating objections in the form of question, the use of *but*, repeating an utterance by a

next or the same speaker, and non-mitigated disagreement. Locher (2004: 96) also adds explanation whether each category is threatening one's face or not. This term is called FTA, face threatening act. FTA is something that said by the speaker that represents a threat to another person's expectation regarding self image. Thus, the categories that threatening one's face are unmitigated strategies, and the categories that are not threatening one's face are mitigated strategies.

2.1.1.1 The use of hedges

Hedges are linguistic devices such as *sort of, maybe, I mean, well.* Aijmer (1986:6) as cited in Locher's book (2004:114) noted that hedges make frees the speaker from the responsibility for the word and saves him the trouble of finding a better word or phrase. Tannen, (1993) as cited in Locher's book (2004) hedges may soften the impact of negative statement. It means that the use of hedge can soft the disagreement expression. According to Locher (2004) there are five categories of hedges which are mostly occured, they are *well, just, uhm* and *uh, I think,* and *I don't know.*

2.1.1.1.1The use of *well*

Well is a multi-functional word. It can be used as an adverb, a noun, and a discourse marker. As a discourse marker, it is used as a marker of insufficiency which indicates some

problems on the content level of the current or the preceding utterance, as a face-threat mitigator which indicates some problems on the interpersonal level, as frame marking device which indicating a topic change or indicates direct reported speech, as a delay device, as sign of waiting for an overdue response, and as sign of aggressiveness (Locher, 2004).

	Example:
229	Debbie: then that's that's valid?
230	Kate: ^absolutely
231	Meriam: well
232	[< <mark>X</mark> XX XXXX X>]
233	Steven: [well but but it's ^not because it's]

In the example, Meriam and Steven uses *well* in showing their disagreement. It can be seen 231 that Meriam uses *well* as face-threatening mitigator to indicate some problems interpersonal level. However, in line 233 Steven uses *well* as a face threatening mitigator and as a marker of insufficiency to indicate some problems in the current utterance by combining its use with *but*.

2.1.1.1.2The use of *Just*

Just has five functions. It can be used as a booster or emphasize, as a restrictive adjunct, as a time adjunct, and as

hedge (Locher, 2004). The' *just* 'could be replaced by 'only' without altering the overall meaning, which mean it is used as a booster.

Example:

183 Steven: but 'that' the key

184 just because they're genetically the same does 'not

mean they=

185 =have ^equal,

186 'potential,

In the example, Steven uses *just* is showing his disagreement. It can be seen in line 184 that Steven uses *just* as a hedge to explain why he rejects statement.

2.1.1.1.3*Uhm* and *uh*

Uhm and uh is examples of hesitation markers which occur in spoken language (Locher, 2004). They are pauses that are used as steps in achieving speaker's goal (Chafe, 1985 in Locher's book (2004). The occurrences of uhm and uh in front of a word search is a form of constitute mitigation in that they try to protect the speaker's own face because they help to indicate that speaker wishes to continue what the speaker want to say and give the speaker time to think about the next utterance (Locher, 2004).

Example:

- Roy: [and] and because they aren't 'that 'many,
- 356 they were binned in ^four separate groups.
- 357 'first group was *uhm*,
- 358 'local *uh* community ^colleges.

In the example, Roy explains the study in greater detail and he can hence allow himself to choose his words carefully. Roy uses *uhm* and *uh* in showing his disagreement. It can be seen in line 357-358 that Roy uses *uhm* and *uh* to give him time to speak something. Locher's argue Roy does not use hesitation *uhm* and *uh* as floor holding device. However, *uhm* and *uh* were used to mitigate an FTA to the addressees' face. In this function they could act as a preface to disagreement.

2.1.1.4The function of *I think*

I think as a hedge or booster. It is used that the speaker is not taking full responsibility for the truth of her or his utterance. It expresses insecurity about the truth value of an utterance that said by the speaker.

Example:

- 52 Roy:well
- ... people are willing to ^pay it.
- Kate: ..it's the [^market,]

- So Roy: $[\langle X \text{ that's right, } x \rangle]$
- Kate: <X XX X> ^people are willing to ^pay [[and]] and *I think it* 'swrong

In the example Kate uses *I think* in line 56 to indicate that her evaluation is personal. The use of *I think* protects her own face because her evaluation becomes less criticizable.

2.1.1.1.5 The use of *I don't know*

Tsui (1991) as cited in Locher's book (2004) noted that *I don't know* has eight functions, they are to declare of inability, to supply information, to avoid making an assessment, to preface a disagreement, to avoid an explicit disagreement, to avoid commitment, to minimize impolite beliefs, and to mark uncertainty (Locher, 2004).

Example:

- 59 Steven: 'How many students are on financial aid?
- 60 Roy: *^I don't' know*
- Kate: ^I think [[it's wrong]]

In the example, Roy uses *I don't know* in line 60 to indicate inability to supply information.

- 17 Kate: That's not including room and board?
- 18 Steven: For an 'undergrad
- 19 Kate: Oh my god so what would be the uh

- Steven: The $\langle X X X X \rangle$ cost
- 21 Roy: ... *I don't know*

In the example, Roy uses I don't know in line 21 to avoid assessment.

2.1.1.2 Giving personally or Emotionally Colored Reasons for

Disagreeing

Giving a personal or emotional colored reason is also used to show disagreement. It is to point the subjectively of a disagreement protects both the speakers' and addressees' face (Locher, 2004). The addressees' face is saved because they might have valid and better reason, which the speakers have not denied yet. For the same reason it also saves the speakers' face because a personal statements based on feelings which cannot be easily disputed.

Example:

- Roy:as long as those 'people are willing to pay it 'it why should we=
- =reduce the price?
- 127 Kate: *Uh it just make me ^mad I don't know why*

Kate uses her disagreement emotionally. It can be seen in line 127 that she uses *mad*, *I don't know why*. Emphasizing personal or emotional reasons in disagreements often occurred in combination with stressing a speaker's own point of view.

2.1.1.3 The Use of Modal Auxiliaries

May, might, could, would and should can be used to soften FTAs. In the appropriate context may, might and could carry the meaning of possibility or ask for permission, would expresses probability or hypothetical meaning and should can express putative, hypothetical or tentative meaning (Quick et al. 1972:97-102 in Locher's book (2004).

Example:

- 424 Roy: Steven *would* tell ^us nothing
- 425 I means ^nothing
- 426 I presented
- 427 Steven: It *might* mean ^something [but it would be very hard to draw a=

Roy uses *would* to criticize Steven in line 424. In line 424 represents an FTA for Steven which is only slightly softened by the modal auxiliaries. In line 427 Steven reacts to Roy's criticism and defends himself. He hedges his disagreement with Roy by making a concession (*it might mean 'something*), which is downgraded by the use of might and something.

2.1.1.4 Shifting Responsibility

Shifting responsibility is a strategy that allows interact ants to portray themselves as not responsible for what they are reporting

15

(Locher, 2004). This can be achieved by clearly marking an utterance as

coming from a different source or by using pronoun such as they or you

to exclude oneself to a certain context or when one is unavoidably

included, to use we in order to spread responsibility.

The advantage of this strategy is that the content of what a

speaker just said might be debatable, but the person as such is not as

exposed to criticism as when he or she had reported the content as her

or his own point of view (Locher, 2004). In this sense this strategy can

be used as a face-protecting device for the speaker.

Example:

Miriam: But 'Roy what was the aim of the sudy was it too look at the

=twins development in,

Roy

: To lool and see whether,

the aim of the study as a suggested the 'study,

byt^Steven has fund^incredible flaws in this

Kate

: @@@@@

Roy does not agree with Miriam's statement and Roy excludes

Steven in his disagreement toward Miriam. Roy mentions Steven

because he wants to say that Steven has found any flaws and it makes

him disagrees with Miriam so that Roy does not take the responsibility

alone when his opinion is debatable.

2.1.1.5 Objection in the Form of a Question

The combination of a question with disagreement is effective especially with respect to action-restriction because both them called an answer (Locher, 2004). Furthermore, disagreement in the form of question is considered as less directly. Locher quoted Leech's (1983) opinion that indirectness is more polite than the direct utterances. The function of this strategy is to ask for a referential clarification of the previous statement, which contains disagreement.

Example:

- 453 Anne: well *\(^\ext{excuse}\) me
- in 'behalf of Steven [I have] to say somethingthough
- 455 Kate: [yeah]
- 456 Steven: ^please
- 457 Meriam: @
- 458 Anne: *^can it 'be?*
- ...the ^prejudice of the
- ...uhm= how do you say ^job giver

Kate reports that students from a renowned private university have better chance on the job market. Anne now intervenes on behalf of Steven. Anne expresses her disagreement in form of question to protect herself, as she becommes less vulnerable to criticism.

2.1.1.6 The Use of *but*

The position of *but* in a statement influences the function of its use (Locher, 2004). When *but* occurred at the beginning of a speaker's new turn and was used to attempt to get the floor as well as to oppose a previous speaker's contribution. However, when *but* occurred within the turn of the same speaker, it was used to indicate disagreement with a previous speaker's utterance.

Example:

- 282 Roy: ^fine
- 283 [^thank you very much]
- 284 Steven: [<X XX X>] the study 'can't be done
- 285 Miriam: but 'Roy was the 'aim of the study was it to 'look at the=
- 286 =twins ^development in

In the example, Miriam disagrees with Steven. She uses *but* in the beginning to show her direct opposition toward Steven's contribution.

2.1.1.7 The Function of Repetition of an Utterance by the Next or the Same Speaker.

The repetition is not only show that the addressee has understood the previous utterance and therefore encourage the addressee to continue, but they also support the primary speaker in that

the second speaker agrees to accept the firs speaker's view (Locher, 2004). However, repetition of a previous utterance can also be a means of voicing of the utterance or to question the content of the utterance (Pomerantz, 1984) as cited in Locher's book (2004).

Example:

- 26 Miriam: but that's for a 'private school right that's [not a--]
- 27 Roy: [yes]
- 28 It's 'not high 'enough
- 29 Anne: ..not high ^enough?
- 30 Kate: $^{\text{Roy}}$
- 31 Roy:..that's right
- 32 Debbie: @@@
- 33 Anne: ^excuse me?

In the example, Anne disagrees with Steven by repeating Roy's statement in line 29 to emphasize point that she wants to make sure to get across. Her disagreement is also expressed in her intonation. The following *^excuse me* further emphasizes her different point of view.

2.1.1.8 Non-mitigating Disagreement Strategies

Kotthoff, 1993 as cited in Locher's book (2004) says that "unmitigated disagreement can occur in contexts where it is more important to defend one's point of view than to pay face considerations to the addressee". Another possible motivation for using non mitigated

disagreement strategies is the wish to be rude, disruptive or hurtful.

Unmitigated disagreement indicates straightforwards disagreement,
which was not accompanied by any additional boosting.

Example:

512 Anne: and ^those are the students that are being recruited from=

513 ='Ivy League

514 [<X XX X>]

515 Roy: ['no 'no 'no 'no 'no]

516 Kate: ['no] 'no 'no?

518 Kate: 'no

519 Roy: the 'argument the argument is exactly the 'opposite

Roy disagrees with Anne's statement directly without softening in line 512. This is questioned by a surprised Kate, so that Roy repeats his disagreement in line 517 and explains it in line 519.

2.1.2 Social Distance and Verbal Disagreement Strategies

One of the social dimensions stated by Holmes social distance (2001). Social distance or solidarity usually effects on the suitable language choice because how well the speaker knows the interlocutor will become one of the most important factor influencing the way he or she talks (Holmes, 2001).

Talking about social distance, there will be two different terms: distant (low solidarity) and intimate (high solidarity). First, distant may refers to a greater social distance between the speaker and the addressee. It means the speaker and addressee do not know each other well (Pair, 2005). On the other hands, intimate may refers to a small social distance between the speaker and the addressee. In other words, the speaker and the addressee know each other well.

There is a correlation between social distance and verbal disagreement strategies. In relation to verbal disagreement strategies, social distance increases; the use of disagreement decreases. Moreover, toward a close person, people will use more unmitigated disagreement by doing FTA. However, toward a distant person, people will use more mitigated disagreement by softening the FTAs.

From this theory presented it can be concluded that social distance and disagreement are linked. Social distance occurs between two people influences the way the disagreement strategies they used. Aside from theories the writer also uses previous studies to support her research.

2.2 Previous Studies

2.2.1 Strategies Used by the Major Male and Female Actors in the Film*The Break Up* in Showing Disagreement (Yuliana, 2009)

Yuliana investigated in analyzing disagreement strategies employed by Gary as the major male actor and Brooke as the female actor in *The Break*

Up. The research questions that she wanted to answer were the disagreement strategies used by Gary in his conversations to Brooke as his interlocutor, the disagreement strategies used by Brooke in her conversations to Gary as her interlocutor, and the differences between them.

The main theory used by Yuliana was disagreement strategies by Locher (2004). There are eight categories: the use of hedges, giving personal or emotional reasons for disagreeing, the use of modal auxiliaries, shifting responsibility, stating objections in the form of question, the use of *but*, repeating an utterance by a next or the same speaker, and non-mitigated disagreement. All of the categories are provided with examples.

The approach she used was qualitative approach. In collecting the data, she used DVD of The Break Up to watch the movie. The duration of the whole movie is one hour and forty six minutes. While watching the movie, she looked for utterances which contain disagreement, produced by Gary and Brooke, and the utterances were used as the basic data of her research.

The finding of Yuliana's study was Gary used hedges most in order to show his disagreement, while Brooke used non-mitigating disagreement most. This result found the theory that women are powerless and use softer ways in showing her disagreement than men. In this study, it was because Brooke has higher power than Gary, so as the result, Brooke become more direct than Gary.

There are some similarities between the present study and Yuliana's study. Both of studies use the same theory by Locher (2004) as the reference.

Moreover, both of studies use movie as an object of the study. However, there is a difference between studies. Yuliana's study focused on gender, while the present study focuses on social distance.

2.2.2 A Study of Disagreement Strategies Produced by Career Woman and Housewives in Sidoarjo by Oktavia (2003)

Oktavia (2003) analyzed the disagreement produced by career woman and housewives in Sidoarjo. Her purpose was to investigate the types of disagreement that was used both career woman and housewives. In doing her research, she used Garcia as the main theory of disagreementand the theory of social status from Beebe and Takash (1989). Her finding of the study showed that career woman tend to use confrontational strategies include strong denial while the housewives tend to use non-confrontational strategies include down toned, suggestion, giving reason, expression of willingness to cooperate.

The writer chooses this study because this study has some similarities and differences. The similarity is both have the same scope discourse analysis, especially on the disagreement strategies. The difference is she analyzed only in woman's disagreement while the writer examined only men's disagreement and different theories. Oktavia used Garcia's theory as the main theory while the writer used Locher's theory. Moreover, Oktavia used discourse comprehension test in collecting her data while writer used DVD in collecting her data.